

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEDICAID INITIATIVES FOR 1990

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I joined with a number of my colleagues in introducing five initiatives designed to improve the ability of the Medicaid Program to meet the needs of the three primary groups of low-income beneficiaries that the program serves: Pregnant women, children, frail elderly, and individuals with mental retardation or a related condition.

Last year, the budget resolution set aside \$200 million in new entitlement authority for fiscal year 1990 "to begin Medicaid initiatives to combat infant mortality, improve child health, make community-based services available to the frail elderly and individuals with mental retardation, and require coverage of hospice services." These initiatives were reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce last July, and were included in the House-passed budget reconciliation bill, H.R. 3299. The final conference agreement on the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, Public Law 101-239, contained a few important expansions targeted at pregnant women and young children.

Unfortunately, many of the initiatives assumed by the fiscal year 1990 budget resolution, reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee, and passed by the House, were not enacted. The initiatives being introduced today are essentially the same provisions that were not enacted in OBRA 1989, except that the effective dates are moved from 1990 to 1991.

I am pleased to join with Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HYDE, and 27 other Members in sponsoring the Medicaid Infant Mortality Amendments of 1990, H.R. 3931, which would implement President Bush's campaign promise to phase in Medicaid coverage for pregnant women and infants with incomes below 185 percent of the Federal poverty level.

I am pleased to join with Mr. SLATTERY and 28 other Members in sponsoring the Medicaid Child Health Amendments of 1990, H.R. 3932, which would implement President Bush's campaign promise to phase in Medicaid coverage for all children in families living below the Federal poverty level.

I am pleased to join with Mr. WYDEN and 64 other Members in sponsoring the Medicaid Frail Elderly Community Care Amendments of 1990, H.R. 3933, which would reduce the institutional bias in the Medicaid Program by giving States the option of offering home and community-based care to frail elderly at risk of nursing home care.

I am pleased to join with Mr. TAUKE, Mr. DINGELL, and 28 other Members in sponsoring the Medicaid Community and Facility Habilita-

tion Services Amendments of 1990, H.R. 3934, which would reduce the institutional bias in the Medicaid Program by giving the States the option of offering community-based services to individuals with mental retardation or a related condition such as epilepsy or cerebral palsy.

Finally, I am pleased to join with Mr. PANETTA and 35 other Members in sponsoring the Medicaid Hospice Amendments of 1990, H.R. 3935, which would require the States that do not already do so to offer hospice benefits under their Medicaid programs to low-income terminally ill patients.

Later this week, I plan to introduce an additional Medicaid initiative to address the AIDS epidemic which is threatening to overwhelm the health care delivery systems in some of our communities.

These initiatives will require new entitlement authority, and I intend to request that the Budget Committee again make allowance for them in this year's budget resolution. I have not been able to obtain from the Congressional Budget Office even preliminary estimates of the additional Federal costs that these initiatives will entail. I am confident, though, that the costs of these improvements will not be large, and that the return on these investments—particularly coverage of prenatal and preventive services for low-income pregnant women and children—will be great.

Some of these bills contain provisions that would impose new mandates on the States, which finance on average about 45 percent of the cost of the Medicaid Program. I propose these initiatives with full awareness that the Governors have requested that we withhold for 2 years on enactment of any further mandates. I do so because I continue to believe that there is broad agreement in the Congress that these modest program improvements are reasonable, and that the needs they address are compelling. I recognize that some of these bills will impose additional requirements on many of the States, but I believe that the additional costs will be modest.

A brief summary of each of the bills follow:

MEDICAID INFANT MORTALITY AMENDMENTS OF 1990 (H.R. 3931)

Phased-in Mandatory Coverage of Pregnant Women and Infants Up to 185 Percent of Poverty. Phases-in mandatory coverage of pregnant women and infants from current law minimum of 133 percent of the Federal poverty level up to 150 percent by July 1, 1991, and up to 185 percent by July 1, 1993.

Prohibits application of resource test for pregnant women or infants, effective July 1, 1991.

Presumptive Eligibility. Revises current presumptive eligibility option for pregnant women by (1) extending period of time by which the woman must file application for benefits and (2) extending presumptive eligibility period to the date State makes a final eligibility determination.

Optional Coverage of Home Visitation Services. Allows the States, at their option, to offer coverage for prenatal and postpartum home visitation services to high-risk pregnant women or infants, as prescribed by a physician. Effective July 1, 1991.

Role in Paternity Determinations. Exempts pregnant women seeking Medicaid coverage for prenatal and delivery services from the requirement that they cooperate with the State in establishing paternity or obtaining child support. Effective on enactment.

MEDICAID CHILD HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1990 (H.R. 3932)

Phased-in Coverage of Children Up to 100 Percent of Poverty. Phases in mandatory coverage of all children in families with incomes below 100 percent of the Federal poverty level. Effective July 1, 1991, States would be required to cover all children below poverty born after September 30, 1983. So long as these children remained poor, they would continue to be eligible for Medicaid, up to age 18. Thus, poor children 7 and over would be "aged in," one year at a time, so that by the year 2000 all poor children under 18 would be covered.

Optional Coverage of Children Up to Age 6 With Incomes Below 185 Percent of the Poverty Level. Under current law, effective April 1, 1990, States are required to cover all children born after September 30, 1983, up to age 6, in families with incomes at or below 133 percent of the poverty level. This provision allows States the option of extending Medicaid to these children with family incomes at or below 185 percent of the poverty level. Effective January 1, 1991.

Applications Using Outreach Locations. Requires States to process applications for Medicaid benefits for pregnant women and infants and children at locations other than welfare offices, including hospitals and clinics. Effective July 1, 1991.

Optional Extension of Medicaid Transition Coverage. Allows States, at their option, to provide an additional 12 months of Medicaid coverage to families who leave cash welfare due to earnings and who continue to work. (Under current law, effective April 1, 1990, States are required to cover these families for 12 months after leaving cash assistance).

Payment for Medically Necessary Services in Disproportionate Share Hospitals to Children under 18. Under current law, with respect to infants under age 1 receiving medically necessary inpatient hospital services from disproportionate share hospitals, States may not limit the number of medically necessary inpatient hospital days they will cover, and, if they reimburse on a prospective basis, must make outlier adjustments for exceptionally high-cost or long-stay cases. These current law provisions would be extended beyond infants to all children under 18, effective July 1, 1991.

Required Coverage of Disabled Children in "209(b)" States. Requires States that apply more restrictive eligibility standards under their Medicaid programs to low-income individuals who receive cash assist-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ance under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program to extend Medicaid coverage to disabled children who qualify for SSI. Effective July 1, 1991.

Mandatory Continuation of Coverage for Children Otherwise Qualified for Benefits Until Redetermination. Prohibits States from terminating Medicaid coverage for a child under 18 who, due to a change in family income or resources, is determined to be ineligible, until the State has determined that the child is not eligible for Medicaid on some other basis. Effective July 1, 1991.

Optional Medicaid Coverage for Foster Children. Allows States, at their option, to offer Medicaid coverage to foster children whose incomes are above State cash assistance levels but below the Federal poverty level. Effective July 1, 1991.

FRAIL ELDERLY COMMUNITY CARE AMENDMENTS (H.R. 3933)

Optional Statewide Service (Sec. 4151). Allows States, at their option, to offer community care services to Medicaid-eligible elderly individuals who are found, based on a comprehensive functional assessment, to be functionally disabled. These are individuals 65 or over who (1) are unable to perform without substantial assistance 2 of the following activities of daily living (toileting, transferring, and eating), or (2) have a primary or secondary diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and is either (1) unable to perform without substantial assistance 2 of the following activities of daily living (bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring, and eating), or (ii) cognitively impaired so as to require substantial supervision because of behaviors that pose serious health or safety hazards.

Community care services include, at State option, one or more of the following: home-maker/home health aide services, chore services, personal care services, nursing care services, respite care, adult day health, and, in the case of individuals with chronic mental illness, day treatment or other partial hospitalization services. Community care services must be provided in accordance with an individual care plan established and coordinated by a qualified case manager. Payments for room and board, or payments made to family members, would not be covered.

States would be subject to a maintenance of effort requirement under which they could receive Federal matching payments only for State spending that exceeds current State or local spending for community care for the frail elderly. In addition, aggregate Federal matching payments for Medicaid community care services in any State would be limited to 30 percent of the aggregate average Medicare per diem payment for SNF care in the State.

The Secretary is directed to develop minimum requirements with respect to community care services and the residential settings in which such services are provided in order to assure that beneficiaries are protected from neglect, abuse, and financial exploitation, and to assure that the quality of such services is adequate. States would be required (1) to conduct annual, unannounced surveys of residential settings to assure compliance with the minimum requirements, and (2) to establish remedies for use in curing noncompliance. The Secretary would be authorized to impose intermediate sanctions, including civil money penalties, in the event of noncompliance.

Effective the later of July 1, 1991, or the date on which the Secretary promulgates interim minimum requirements.

MEDICAID COMMUNITY AND FACILITY HABILITATION SERVICES AMENDMENTS (H.R. 3934)

PART A. COMMUNITY HABILITATION AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Optional Statewide Service. Allows States, at their option, to offer community habilitation and supportive services to Medicaid-eligible individuals with mental retardation or a related condition. States would be subject to a maintenance of effort requirement under which they could receive Federal matching payments only for State spending that exceeds current State or local spending with respect to community-based services for individuals with mental retardation or related conditions.

If offered, these services would, at a minimum, have to include case management, respite care, and personal attendant care, but could also include prevocational, education, supported employment, and other supportive services. Payments for room and board, or payments made to family members, would not be covered. Effective the later of July 1, 1991, or the date on which the Secretary promulgates interim requirements to assure the health, safety, and welfare of clients.

Quality Assurance. Requires that community habilitation and supportive services be provided consistent with the objectives of independence, productivity, and integration, in accordance with an individual habilitation plan that is based upon a comprehensive functional assessment. The Secretary is directed to develop minimum requirements with respect to providers of community services, and residential settings in which such services are provided, in order to protect the health, welfare, and safety of clients. Procedures for monitoring and remedies for enforcing compliance with these minimum requirements are established. In addition, States would be required to develop their own programs and standards for assuring the quality of these community services.

Eliminating Prior Institutionalization Requirement. Deletes the requirement in the current "2176" home and community-based services waiver authority that individuals receiving habilitation services under the waiver be discharged from an institution.

Annual Report and Evaluation. Directs the Secretary to (1) report to Congress annually on the extent of compliance with the minimum requirements for community habilitation and supportive services and for residential settings in which such services are provided, and (2) report to the Congress, by January 1, 1993, on the effectiveness of existing outcome-oriented instruments and methods in evaluating and assuring the quality of such services.

PART B. QUALITY ASSURANCE FOR HABILITATION FACILITY SERVICES

Requirements for Habilitation Services. Sets forth requirements that habilitation facilities (now known as intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded, or ICFs/MR) must meet in order to participate in the Medicaid program, including those relating to provision of services, clients' rights, and administration. As under current law, these facilities would be required to provide "active treatment" to individuals with mental retardation or related conditions. Effective January 1, 1992.

Survey and Certification Process. Requires States to conduct annual, unannounced surveys of all habilitation facilities other than those operated by the State to assure compliance with the requirements of

participation. Requires the Secretary to conduct "look behind" surveys, on a sample basis, to assure the adequacy of State survey efforts, and to conduct annual, unannounced surveys of all facilities operated by the State. Effective January 1, 1992.

Enforcement Process. Requires States to establish intermediate sanctions, including civil money penalties, to remedy noncompliance with the requirements of participation. Provides intermediate sanction authority for the Secretary. Revises the current correction and reduction plan authority. Effective on enactment.

Annual Report. Directs the Secretary to report annually to Congress on the extent to which habilitation facilities are complying with the requirements of participation.

PART C. APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION OR A RELATED CONDITION

State Preadmission Screening and Annual Review Requirements. Requires States, effective January 1, 1992, to have in place a program for (1) determining, prior to admission, whether individuals with mental retardation or related condition require the level of service provided by a habilitation facility and (2) reviewing, at least annually, whether clients residing in habilitation facilities continue to require the level of services provided by the facility. Payment would not be made under Medicaid for facility services in cases where the preadmission screen or annual review found that an individual did not require such services.

Revision of Utilization Review Provisions. Repeals, effective with the implementation of the preadmission screening and annual review requirements, the current law provisions relating to physician certification and inspection of care as they apply to habilitation facilities.

PART D. PAYMENT FOR SERVICES

Payment for Community Habilitation and Supportive Services and Habilitation Facility Services. Requires that States which elect to cover either community habilitation and supportive services, or habilitation services, or both, pay rates that are reasonable and adequate to meet the costs of providing services efficiently and economically in conformity with applicable laws and regulations. Prohibits States from using methodologies which distinguish between State-operated and other providers. Effective July 1, 1991, with respect to community habilitation and supportive services, and January 1, 1992, with respect to habilitation services.

PART E. EMPLOYEE PROTECTION AND MISCELLANEOUS

Employee Protections for Closures and Reductions in Capacity. Requires States to establish "fair and equitable" arrangements to protect the interests of employees of habilitation facilities that are subject to a closure or reduction in capacity, including the establishment of paid retraining programs and the preservation of rights under applicable collective bargaining agreements. Requires States to offer to employees displaced from State facilities undergoing closure or reduction, employment (at the same compensation and with comparable job responsibilities) in providers of community services or in residential settings. Effective on enactment.

Use of State Developmental Disabilities Agencies. Clarifies that States may assign specific Medicaid management functions to the State agency responsible for develop-

mentally disabled individuals. Effective on enactment.

MEDICAID HOSPICE AMENDMENTS (H.R. 3935)

Mandating Hospice Coverage. Requires States, effective July 1, 1991, to offer hospice coverage to terminally ill Medicaid beneficiaries. Clarifies that, in electing hospice coverage, a beneficiary does not waive the right to personal attendant care.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1990, marked the 72d anniversary of Ukraine's declaration of independence. I want to join all of our colleagues in commemorating this anniversary. I recently came across an article in the Wall Street Journal concerning the religious persecution Soviet communism has inflicted on Ukrainians. I believe we can all benefit from reading this article since it reminds us what a precious gift freedom is, and how we too often take it for granted.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD "In Ukraine, Faith in God—Not in Gorbachev", by Edward McFadden, in the Wall Street Journal, Thursday, February 1, 1990:

(From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 1, 1990)

IN UKRAINE, FAITH IN GOD—NOT IN
GORBACHEV

(By Edward McFadden)

When the Soviet Council for Religious Affairs announced on Dec. 1 that Ukrainian Catholics would be allowed to register and "enjoy all the rights established by law for religious communities in the Ukrainian SSR," members of the long-banned church were justifiably unenthusiastic. Last week leaders of the Ukrainian Catholic Church gathered in Lvov, declared the church's dissolution in 1946 null and void, and announced that the church would from that moment on function as a fully legal entity within the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian Catholics' faith in God and lack of same in the Soviet system has led to a quiet revolution.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church's history began in 1596 through an agreement between the Ukrainian Church of the Byzantine Rite and the Church of Rome in which the Ukrainian Catholics, also known as Uniates, pledged allegiance to the papacy but kept their Byzantine liturgy, language and church hierarchy. Josef Stalin banned the church in 1946 through the so-called Synod of Lvov, which forcibly "self-dissolved" the church and merged it with the Communist-backed Russian Orthodox Church. Uniate clergy who refused to surrender their allegiance to Rome and become Russian Orthodox priests were sent to Siberia. All Uniate property was confiscated, most of it going to the Orthodox Church.

Since then, many Ukrainian Catholics have practiced their faith in fields, forests or late in the evening in private homes. Today there are an estimated 3.5 million practicing Ukrainian Catholics in the Soviet Union, the majority of whom reside in Western Ukraine and are counted in official Soviet documents as Russian Orthodox. The Ukrainian Church is overseen by Cardinal

Myroslav Lubachivsky from Rome along with 10 bishops in Ukraine, seven of whom only recently came out of hiding (where the other three remain).

Because the Uniates make up the largest Catholic group in the Soviet Union, Pope John Paul II has long placed the legalization of the Ukrainian Church high on his list of concerns in his limited dealings with the Soviet Union. During the historic two-day meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and the pontiff in Rome in late November, the Ukrainian Church was discussed often.

Vatican officials, whose policy it is to comment only under the condition of anonymity, say that the pope was willing to make a major concession, promising that should Mr. Gorbachev allow the full legalization of the Uniate Church the pontiff would not press for the return of all church property, the major stumbling block to the Russian Orthodox Church supporting legalization of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Despite the talks, however, the Ukrainian Church gained little from the Soviets that it already didn't have. Ivan Hel, head of the Lvov-based Committee for the Defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, told reporters that the new policy giving Ukrainian Catholics the right to register as Uniates "does not provide a real legal basis for the church. It does not recognize the 1946 [self-dissolution of the Church] as illegal and does not guarantee the return of property." In fact, there is no guarantee that congregations that apply for registration will even be accepted by the government.

According to officials of the Ukrainian Church in Rome, more than 700 congregations have applied for registration with Soviet officials but only 20 have been approved. More important, the church still does not have legal standing.

Over the past two years, Mr. Gorbachev has used his still-unenacted "Freedom of Conscience" bill, which purportedly would give all religions the same legal standing and property privileges as the official Russian Orthodox Church, to placate religious groups and their leaders—first with Lithuanian Catholics in mid-1988, and then in early 1989 when unrest among Moslems began to grow. When the pope pressed for Ukrainian Church legalization, Mr. Gorbachev once again promised a law early in 1990.

Vatican officials say they have not been consulted by Soviet officials about the law, and Ukrainian Church officials have not seen any of the three draft versions that are said to exist. The issue of church ownership of property might not even be considered in the law, since a Vatican source familiar with the continuing negotiations between Rome and Moscow says that Mr. Gorbachev feels that return of Ukrainian Church property is an issue to be resolved between the Russian Orthodox Church and Ukrainian Catholics.

Such inter-church negotiations began two weeks ago in Moscow, but the Russian Orthodox Church is hesitant to surrender any of the property it holds in Ukraine and the numbers bear out why: The Orthodox Church claims to have more than 10,000 parishes in the Soviet Union. More than 5,700 of the total are in Ukraine—3,000 of these in Western Ukraine. All told, about 60% of the Orthodox Church's holdings are in the republic. A mass re-conversion of members and property to the Ukrainian Catholic Church could be crippling to the Russian Orthodox Church.

In October, before the registration rule was enacted, Ukrainian Catholics were al-

ready growing weary of the lip service from Mr. Gorbachev and the Russian Orthodox hierarchy. Beginning with the annexation of Lvov's Church of the Transfiguration, believers have peaceably seized more than 600 churches formerly held by the Russian Orthodox Church. More than 350 Russian Orthodox priests have asked to be accepted as priests for the Ukrainian Church—all have been accepted. While the buildings technically belong to the Russian Orthodox Church, there is little the Orthodox Church can do when an entire parish—led by the parish clergy—returns to the fold of the Ukrainian Church.

In some areas of Western Ukraine, such as the town of Ivano-Frankivsk, where 100,000 of the 250,000 residents have been known to hold Sunday prayer services in the town square, there are no longer any functioning Russian Orthodox Churches. Reports from Ukraine confirm that the taking of these churches has been peaceful, yet the Russian Orthodox Church has attempted to distort the story.

In a confidential cable sent Dec. 23 to Russian Orthodox Church leaders outside the Soviet Union, Archbishop Kirill, chairman of external church relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, reported that the Resurrection Cathedral in Ivano-Frankivsk had been taken "by force. . . . [And] many Orthodox churches in Lvov, Ternopol and other cities and villages have been seized. . . . I ask you to exert influence on the Christian and social circles of the country in which you are residing in favor of a most swift and peaceful resolution of the problem." This is the same man who has called publicly for brotherly negotiations between the two churches.

The Russian Orthodox Church, in the hope of coming away with something for its 44-year domination of the region's religious life, is requesting inter-church dialogue based on Christian love and understanding to resolve the current impasse without the aid of the Soviet government. But the Uniates note that only the state can give back what the state has taken away: the rights of religious freedom and the ownership of property.

A VIEW FROM ACROSS THE BIG LAKE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, during my recent visit to Great Britain, the following commentary from the London Sunday Telegraph was brought to my attention. I found it most enlightening, especially since my next stop was Czechoslovakia to meet with President Havel.

I agree with the author's assessment that the policies and values long heralded by the conservatives in the West like Konrad Adenauer in Germany, Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain, and Ronald Reagan here in the United States, inspired the popular uprisings on Eastern Europe. As many of the liberal-left policies have failed in the West, their more concentrated Communist-Socialist versions have totally bombed in the East. The East Germans, Poles, Czechoslovakians, Hungarians, Roma-

nians, and others have not cast off communism for the West's so-called enlightened Socialism. Having long been the victims of such policies, they know the dangers of them. Instead, they yearn for free enterprise and less government. In fact, today's Eastern European Socialists sound more like conservative Republicans.

As we begin this new decade, I strongly suggest my colleagues keep these observations in mind when focusing on both Eastern European and domestic policy.

[From the London, England, Sunday Telegraph, Jan. 7, 1990]

THE RIGHT WAY TO FREEDOM
(By Peregrine Worsthorne)

What we are seeing in Eastern Europe and to a large extent in the Soviet Union are conservative counter-revolutions—popular uprisings inspired by sentiments and causes owing much more to the right than to the left. The Christian Churches can take the lion's share of the credit; so can old-fashioned racism and nationalism and, in the case of Romania, even monarchism. Nothing here to rejoice the free-thinking progressive heart. From the new libertarian right, as against the old reactionary right, comes another enormously important contribution: the yearning for private enterprise, private ownership, in a word, capitalism. The desire for freedom is obviously crucial. But to an extent not yet recognized, still less admitted, in the West it is freedom to do things which progressives and socialists deplore.

Yet this is not at all the impression being given in much of the media—particularly television. Anybody watching television over Christmas might have supposed that the conservatives were the baddies being toppled from power, and the goodies doing the toppling were all Eastern European replicas of 1968 student rebels led, in the case of Czechoslovakia, by a radical playwright called Havel, first cousin of our own beloved Harold Pinter. Instead of the evil President Ceausescu being accurately described as a hard-line, far-left communist, he was presented as a right-wing conservative or even, in some quarters, as a Romanian version of our own Iron Lady.

The same ideologically distorting language is also applied to Russian politics. Those communist hard-liners opposing Mr. Gorbachev's stumbling attempts to do to Russia's socialist economy a mini version of what Mrs. Thatcher has done to Britain's socialist economy are described—in exactly the same way as Mrs. Thatcher herself is described—as belonging to the conservative right. Thus everything and everybody in Eastern Europe and Russia on the wrong side is right-wing and everything and everybody on the side of the angels is, by implication, left-wing. In truth, of course, Mr. Gorbachev's opponents are all hard-line, unreconstructed leftists—the very people who have least in common with anything that can be meaningfully described as right-wing.

So have we been witnessing a gigantic media conspiracy to deny right-wing ideas the credit for getting rid of the evil communist tyrannies and to rescue left-wing ideas from the blame for having installed those tyrannies in the first place? Not a conscious conspiracy, in my view. I don't suspect any Orwellian-type BBC newspeak policy. Would that there were such a malign conspiracy. For conspiracies can be exposed and defeated. What cannot be so easily exposed and defeated is a mind-set that is simply

unable to comprehend the possibility that freedom and conservatism can be found on the same side of the barricades.

Because the people on the streets in Eastern Europe are obviously all good democrats—and mostly young to boot—it has to follow that they are progressive rather than reactionary, since progress is what democracy is assumed, as an article of faith, to be all about. But in Eastern Europe, it isn't. In Eastern Europe, progressivism, as understood in the West, does not even appeal to the intellectuals, let alone the masses. What have Western progressives or leftists ever done for Eastern Europe—absolutely nothing, except hobnob with the socialist tyrants. It is religion that has fueled the flames of resistance; as have nationalism and racism and also capitalism. The implication of this for Western leftists and progressives is too awful to contemplate: that in the great struggle between good and evil, at least in the last half of the 20th century, their ideals have played a far less honourable part in civilisation's victory than those of the despised right which were assumed to have been relegated to the dust-heap of history.

Sooner, rather than later, however, Western progressives and leftists are going to have to recognise the implications for them of the Eastern European experience. At the moment there is a profound and understandable reluctance to face the truth unblinkingly. Cardinal Hume, that great liberal Catholic, is as bad in this respect as the media. Addressing an educational conference last week he said the demands for freedom in central and Eastern Europe were "neither a victory for free enterprise capitalism, nor an affirmation of every aspect of Western society". Instead, he went on, they indicated "a longing for a more caring, more human, more equal society"—i.e., the kind of society Mr. Kinrock is always talking about, and blaming Mrs. Thatcher for destroying. The good prelate is talking through his cardinal's hat; grotesquely underestimating the profound suspicion that such language—which has become socialist language—arouses even among intellectuals in Eastern Europe. Here in Britain the socialist decades only vaccinated a minority of intellectuals against the affliction of progressive cant. But in Eastern Europe, where progressive cant was actually put into practice—for the Banns of this world achieved total power—pretty well the entire educated class, as well as most of the manual workers, have passionately turned against it, using language to express the vehemence of their disgust which makes Sun editorials seem positively restrained.

It won't be long before these East European intellectuals are able to join in the Western political debate on a regular basis. When they do, all the apologists for socialism in this country—those appalling South Bank playwrights, for example—will be put to shame. Rather than the full danger of anti-semitism only became clear once the Holocaust victims, liberated from the camps, were free to describe its lethal consequences, so will the full dangers of socialism only become clear once the East European writers are free to describe its consequences in no less lurid and scarring detail.

Nor is it only socialism that will then become a taboo practice—as unacceptable in civilised society as anti-semitism. Many other bien pensant assumptions will be discredited as well—supra-Nationalism, for one. At the moment the East European states are simply determined to get out of Come-

con—the Russian variation of an Economic Community. But having escaped Comecon's clutches it is very doubtful whether they will want to see their economic fate determined by bureaucrats in Brussels. Western European bien pensants may like to peddle the fashionable idea that national sovereignty means nothing nowadays. But the East European nations, who have had 50 years without national sovereignty, know better. Mr. Enoch Powell made a good point last Friday. "The East Europeans," he said, "have not seized self-government and self-determination in order to give those precious gains up just because Americans, Germans and Russians, too, have acquired the habit of prating about 'one Europe'."

Scepticism will be the contribution of the East Europeans. Idiots in London and Paris may suppose that a German-dominated European Community will be the harbinger of milk and honey. But I doubt whether that kind of talk will pass muster in Prague or Bucharest. Bureaucracy, supra-nationalism, social engineering, economic planning—it is impossible to overestimate the loathing for these concepts to be found in Eastern Europe—where they have been tried a 1' ou-
trance. In Britain Mrs. Thatcher's hatred for these concepts may seem a bit far-fetched or hysterical. But in Eastern Europe it is she, more than any other public figure in the West, who inspires confidence and admiration—and not only from know-nothing reactionaries but from all classes of people who have found out to their terrible cost just how much the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

The sooner she puts this to the test, the better. My guess is that she would be received in Eastern Europe with scenes of enthusiasm not rivalled since Woodrow Wilson visited there just after the First World War. He was an arch-liberal; she, an arch-conservative. What better way of measuring how popular opinion has changed. Now it is in the arch-conservative that the masses with genuine experience of hardship and oppression choose to put their trust.

**TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
WILLIAM H. NATCHER**

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, all of us from Kentucky feel just a bit prouder when the dean of our congressional delegation, the Honorable WILLIAM H. NATCHER, is recognized for his outstanding service in the House of Representatives.

A recent New York Times editorial spoke to the trend toward a higher percentage of participation in rollcall votes by Members of the 101st Congress. In any such review—past, present, or even future—BILL NATCHER has no equal. His record is, as the editorial aptly describes, "perfection."

And, another recent survey conducted among top congressional aides named BILL NATCHER as one of the most respected Members of the House. These distinctions come as no surprise to those of us who have had the privilege to serve with him for some time. He is the personification of honor and integri-

ty, and a model for all who may be privileged to serve in this Chamber.

I salute my friend and colleague from Kentucky's Second Congressional District and am pleased to share with all my colleagues the following New York Times editorial and news article from Roll Call:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 8, 1990]

COUNTING ON CONGRESS

Members of the 101st Congress, on average, showed up for 95 percent of the roll call votes in last year's session. That was the highest rate of participation in the 36 years that Congressional Quarterly magazine has been keeping track. At first glance, it might appear that the 101st is attending more to its legislative obligations. On second glance, there may be less to attend.

Senators and Congressmen are careful to participate in roll call votes whenever possible; too many absences are an easy target for challengers in the next election. While a member's presence for roll calls is hardly a valid measure of his or her effectiveness, it is a much-used yardstick, readily understood by voters.

In 1989, House members averaged 94 percent participation, and Senate members 98 percent. The overall average has been zig-zagging upward from 79 percent in 1970. Participation goes up in odd-numbered years and down in even-numbered years, when members are out campaigning.

Despite the long-term upward trend, two developments suggest that last year's record was at least partly illusory. First, there were significantly fewer roll call votes than before. The Senate had 312 in 1989, down from 379 in 1988 and 420 in 1987. The drop-off in House voting was equally sharp, down 25 percent in two years.

Second, in recent years the Senate seems to have grasped a basic Congressional truth that the House knew already—namely, that members like long weekends. It thus scheduled more votes for the middle of the week. In 1989, the Senate had only five roll-call votes on a Monday.

Two senators and 34 House members scored less than 90 percent in Congressional Quarterly's 1989 tally, but 20 senators and 13 representatives scored 100 percent. William Natcher, a Kentucky Democrat, is the undisputed champ. A House member since 1954, and next in line to chair the Appropriations Committee, he hasn't missed a vote yet.

For what it's worth, that's perfection.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 29, 1990]

FOLEY MOST RESPECTED, NATCHER IS SECOND, BRADLEY LIKELY NOMINEE IN 1992, POLL FINDS

(By Karen Foerstel)

Speaker Tom Foley (D-Wash) is the most respected Member of the House, Majority Leader George Mitchell (D-Maine) is the most respected in the Senate, and Sen. Bill Bradley (D-NJ) will be the Democratic nominee for president in 1992, according to a new survey of House and Senate staffers.

The annual survey, conducted by the Washington public relations firm Fleishman-Hillard Inc., polled 292 top administrative and legislative aides over a two-week period.

For the third year in a row, Foley was overwhelmingly chosen the most respected House Member, winning 59 percent.

The come-from-behind second with 6 percent of the vote was 19-term Rep. Bill Natcher (D-Ky). Last year, Natcher was voted eighth most respected in the House.

Minority Leader Bob Michel (R-Ill) held on to this third-place finish for the second year in a row with 5 percent of the vote.

Last year, Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla) finished second and House Speaker Jim Wright (D-Texas) was fifth. Pepper died last May. Wright resigned from Congress last June.

"This has just made my weekend," Natcher said Friday after being informed of his second-place finish. "I'm delighted. It's a distinct honor, even more so because it comes from the proper sources. [Staffers] are the people who, I think, know more about the Members of Congress than anyone else on Capitol Hill."

Natcher, ironically, has one of the smallest personal staffs on the Hill, with only five aides. He also holds the record for consecutive votes. In his 36 years in Congress, Natcher has never missed a vote, casting his ballot over 12,114 times.

On the Senate side, Mitchell was voted the most respected for the second year in a row with 39 percent, and Minority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan) held on to his spot as runner-up with 14 percent.

Rep. Alan Simpson (R-Wyo) moved up from fourth to third this year with 8 percent of the vote.

Falling from third to fifth in the Senate was former vice-presidential candidate Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas). He received 3 percent of the votes cast.

Bentsen, however, finished second when respondents were asked, "Who will be the Democratic nominee for president in 1992?" Bentsen scored 16 percent behind Bradley's 23 percent.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LAWRENCE FRAIBERG

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I address my colleagues in the House today, for I rise to extend my heartiest congratulations and warmest best wishes to Mr. Lawrence P. Fraiberg. The National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences will be honoring Mr. Fraiberg with its Trustees Award.

Mr. Fraiberg has been the president of MCA Broadcasting since 1977. His long career in the communication industry began in 1949 when he graduated from the University of California and joined Group W Television station KPIX in San Francisco. He became general sales manager after 10 years and left to join Metromedia in 1959. In 1965 he became vice president and general manager of Metromedia's flagship station, WNEW-TV in New York and, after leaving in 1969 to form his own motion picture and television production company, he returned to manage WNEW-TV again in 1971. In 1977, Mr. Fraiberg was named president of Metromedia Television. He returned to Group W (Westinghouse Broadcasting) in January 1980 where he was appointed president of the Television Station Group.

An active member in community and industry organizations, he is a recipient of an honorary degree (1978) from St. John's University, New York. In May 1986 he was honored

with a Peabody Award for Lifetime Achievement in the Broadcasting Industry. He is presently on the board of directors of the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, Inc. and the National Corporate Fund for Dance, Inc. He is a former member of the board of trustees of Emerson College in Boston, and is currently a member of the executive committee of the National Committee for American Foreign Policy. Mr. Fraiberg is a member of the board of the Theatre Development Fund, the Tony Management Committee, and the Dramatists Guild. He also serves on the board of trustees of Outward Bound, USA.

Mr. Speaker I am proud to join in paying tribute to this exceptional man and extend my appreciation on behalf of his efforts and offer my best wishes for continued success.

HEARINGS ON AIDS FUNDING

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1989, the House Budget Committee Task Force on Human Resources held hearings on one of the most pressing issues of the day: AIDS funding. I am pleased to share with my colleagues the testimony of two of the outstanding witnesses who testified before us on that day.

TESTIMONY BY MAYOR ART AGNOS

Madam Chair, Congressman Buechner, I would like to thank you for bringing your Committee to San Francisco for these hearings.

This past week, my Task Force on the HIV Epidemic released its report on care needs. They stated clearly that the San Francisco model, which has drawn national and world attention for its compassion and its effectiveness, "is near collapse."

Since this epidemic began, there have been more than 5,000 deaths in our city.

That is more than all the San Franciscans who were killed in World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam—combined and tripled.

That is a toll from ten years.

In the next three years, we estimate that more than another 5,000 San Franciscans will die in this epidemic. Nearly another 5,000 will be diagnosed and living with AIDS in the next three years.

Those numbers alone would give us reason to conclude that the San Francisco model is near collapse.

But what threatens us most of all, is not a grim inevitability in this epidemic.

It is that now, for the first time, there is reason to hope that we can stave off death with early intervention treatments.

And yet the hope that science and research has bought comes at a price that government won't pay.

Until a year ago, the San Francisco model was primarily AIDS education, out-patient hospital care and hospice.

There wasn't much in-between.

Last June, at the Montreal International AIDS Conference, Dr. James Mason announced that the U.S. Government would shortly approve aerosol pentamidine to prevent pneumonia in people with AIDS.

It was a major breakthrough.

In San Francisco, over half of those who have died have died from pneumonia.

But at that Conference, Dr. Mason also said that it was his duty as a federal health policy leader to see that all those who needed this treatment would get it.

That hasn't happened.

Federal rules will not pay for early treatment before pneumonia sets in.

They will pay the estimated \$17,000 hospitalization cost after pneumonia has hit.

But even though this would pay for 16 years of early intervention treatments, they will not pay to prevent pneumonia in those who are extremely vulnerable.

San Francisco and California does pay for it.

This state is the only one of the 50 states that will pay for early intervention, and we do it entirely with state and local dollars.

There is something seriously wrong with a federal policy that requires people to go to death's door before they find a welcome mat.

The standard we follow, and the standard I am here to urge be the basis for your budget resolution, provides care for those who would benefit from treatment—not just those who are dying because they didn't get treatment earlier on.

But this city can not do it alone.

Already more than one in every ten city health dollars we spend goes to AIDS.

We have used those city funds to pioneer education programs, outreach programs and care programs.

But too often, we have seen the federal government fund demonstration projects based on our successes and then rule us ineligible because we already have a program.

It's become known as the "San Francisco penalty"—provide care now, lose funding later.

Knowing that city government could not do it alone, last year I named a Mayor's Task Force on the HIV Epidemic. It was the first in our City and perhaps the first in any City to include representatives from every sector of city life.

I gave them a mandate to examine what San Francisco needs for a comprehensive and compassionate program to combat AIDS and stop its spread. And I asked them for a strategy involving both the private and the public sector of all San Francisco, not just the communities hardest hit or the voluntary agencies that have carried the burden thus far.

They have now issued recommendations that are clear and compelling, and they have identified what we need to pay.

We spend \$12 million from all sources for prevention programs now—we need \$25 million.

We spend \$13 million from all sources for prevention among IV drug users now—we need to spend \$31 million.

We spend between \$10 million and \$25 million from all sources on early intervention—we need to spend \$103 million.

We spend \$123 million on a continuum of care—and we need to spend \$151 million.

In all, the gap we face is between \$137 million and \$152 million—next year.

To close that gap, we are marshaling our resources into a unified strategy.

The Task Force recommended that as Mayor, I designate a Standards of Care Committee that would establish guidelines on early treatment.

If private companies and insurers believe that there is a level playing field, and that each faces the same commitments, then they have indicated a willingness to include

early treatment in standard health care programs.

As Mayor, responsible for a city workforce of some 25,000 employees, I will make the City of San Francisco a model employer by working with our insurers to provide this level of care for our employees.

I believe that the private sector will join us, and that what we begin in San Francisco can become a new national model of a public private partnership in care standards.

But that will not be enough.

We have refined our participation in existing federal programs, and our success in documenting actual needs resulted in over \$5.6 million in federal funding to reduce waiting lists at substance abuse treatment programs.

We have been creative in using other funds, such as Community Development Block Grants to provide housing for the homeless with AIDS and ARC.

But these steps are not enough.

And while we stretch ourselves as never before—and still fall short—we are deeply disturbed by the indications that Congress may not stretch the budget for AIDS at all.

Last year, for the first time, Congress appropriated less for AIDS than it knew had been proposed by the U.S. Public Health Service. In all, some \$1.7 billion was budgeted—not the \$2.2 billion sought by Public Health.

This year, given the Congressional climate and the Gramm Rudman restrictions, last year's \$1.7 billion may also become this year's ceiling.

That will happen unless the Budget Resolution includes meeting the real costs we are facing.

I began by comparing the number of deaths in our City from AIDS to the deaths of San Franciscans who fought in our nation's wars.

I did that because today, as you deliberate, we are entering a national debate about a "peace dividend" because we are reassessing our national defense requirements.

In my opinion, the battle against AIDS is a matter of our nation's defenses, and so far the record from Washington is to treat this as somebody else's war.

This is not somebody else's war.

If this city, of all cities, falls so far behind that our program collapses, all the world will shudder at what it means for them.

It will mean that each city, each person will have been left to cope—and die—on their own.

It will mean no help is on the way.

In San Francisco, the Mayor's Task Force on the HIV Epidemic marks a firm commitment that we are making to each other to provide help.

We need you to join us.

I have with me today Mr. Lee Smith, President of Levi Strauss International, and a member of the Task Force.

TESTIMONY OF LEE C. SMITH

Good morning. My name is Lee Smith. I am a member of Mayor Agnos's HIV Task Force in San Francisco and President of Levi Strauss International.

As you know, our community is one that has worked hard to garner the resources necessary to meet the needs of those affected by HIV.

Our community-based organizations, our local government, and the local business community were some of the "first responders" in their fields to attempt to meet the grave needs presented by AIDS.

Nevertheless, my year on the Mayor's HIV Task Force has brought me face-to-face with the harsh reality created by a prolonged epidemic. Quite simply, the duration and scope of the HIV crisis have outpaced the currently available resources to fight it.

Today you will hear others outline the discrepancy between the limits of local resources and the exploding needs of HIV disease. The discrepancy is daunting. With your help, it is also surmountable.

Each of us have unique resources we can and must contribute to the fight against AIDS. I believe that is as true for the San Francisco business community as it is for members of your committee.

Let me speak first to the role I believe is appropriately assumed by the business community.

The Mayor's HIV Task Force has identified seven essential ways we can fight HIV. I wholly endorse these recommendations and believe their implementation will go a long way toward easing the horrible toll HIV is exacting in the Bay Area.

First, we must educate employees and continually restate the facts about HIV transmission. For many adults, the work place is the only place where this life-saving information will be available. We cannot miss the opportunity to educate and inform this sector of our society.

Second, the business community must improve health benefits and access to decent, affordable health care for its employees.

AIDS is exacerbating an already overburdened and costly health care system. The business community should lead the way in addressing systemic changes necessary to lower health care costs, provide access to treatment for those in need and prevent or delay disease progression.

The private sector must carry its fair share of the health care burden without instituting or condoning unfair discriminatory practices in private insurance coverage.

This is critical to implementing sane early intervention programs making life extending drugs available, through insurance coverage, to all who require them.

Third, we need to recruit volunteers to provide much needed skills and labor for AID-related services in the Bay Area.

To date, an heroic effort has been made by many. Literally hundreds of thousands of hours have been voluntarily given to support the San Francisco Model of community-based care. But the past and current volunteers cannot keep up with the burgeoning case load. They are shouldering a disproportionate share of the responsibility for handling an epidemic that is a community-wide problem.

We need employers to proactively encourage their people to volunteer.

Fourth, businesses can help by enhancing skills of community-based organizations.

Many of the agencies in the Bay Area are now multi-million dollar operations. Businesses can lend technical assistance in such areas as financial and long range planning and personnel development. We can also provide in-kind services like photocopying, transportation and printing capabilities.

Fifth, private corporation and foundation monies are essential for our agencies. These desperately needed funds often cover vital programs the state and federal governments cannot or will not support.

Please do not misunderstand me. In an epidemic, the federal government has and is expected to take a large share of the funding responsibility. Nevertheless, responsible corporations and business people also have

an obligation to give—and give generously—to community-based agencies which, for too long, have had to bear the brunt of the epidemic.

Sixth, businesses must work to stamp out discrimination. In our community, AIDS-related discrimination often takes on more subtle, though no less insidious, forms. The presence of discrimination is costly to San Francisco businesses and to people with HIV disease.

In a recent San Francisco survey of self-identified gay men who chose not to be tested for HIV antibodies, the primary reason was fear of loss of health insurance.

This is a horrifying fact and a justifiable fear on the part of these men. If individuals could possibly benefit from antibody testing, treatment or monitoring, they must be able to come forward for assistance without fear of losing their health benefits altogether.

Discrimination against those with HIV disease or those presumed to be infected with HIV is unwarranted, unacceptable and inhumane. It must be abolished.

Seventh and finally, the business community must actively support reasoned public policies. Businesses must make their concerns known in Washington and we must articulate our beliefs regarding the above recommendations. Rather than divert scarce resources to fight discriminatory propositions, like Prop. 102, we need to support forward looking legislation like The Americans with Disabilities Act.

That's more or less what we in the business community can and will do.

But our effectiveness depends on your effectiveness. Here's what you can do.

You can be willing to take political risks and support impact aid and disaster relief measures so that adequate monies are appropriated to assist cities hardest hit by HIV.

You can respond to this prolonged crisis with the same urgency and intensity with which you responded to the earthquake.

You can provide and encourage a well informed, reasoned and expeditious response from our federal government to assist us in ending this epidemic.

You can provide this community with the financial resources essential to fight this epidemic.

We can work together and succeed or we can fail each other and consequently fail our community, AIDS-related discrimination often takes on more subtle, though no less insidious, forms.

BUT WHY NOT MORE HELP FOR AFRICA?

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you an editorial titled, "But Why Not More Help for Africa?" (Washington Post, February 1, 1990) by Leonard H. Robinson, Jr., the president of the African Development Foundation. The editorial poignantly describes my angst about the way in which the administration and Congress have been focusing on providing assistance to Eastern Europe. Last year, the United States efforts to galvanize assistance for Poland and Hungary were impressive. Despite our concerns about the budget

deficit, we found \$900 million of resources to assist the development of Poland and Hungary which are to be distributed over 3 years. This year we are looking into more ways to assist other Eastern European countries that have undergone reform, not to mention the \$500 million proposed aid for Panama.

But, Mr. Speaker, what about Africa? There have been democratic reforms in a number of countries in Africa, like Guinea, Ghana, and Madagascar. But those reforms, as real as they are, have been overshadowed by the changes in Eastern Europe. Further, what about the world's and Africa's newest nation, soon-to-be independent Namibia? Why is it that our administration appears to have no commitment for creating an assistance policy that reinforces United States support for democracy in this new nation comparable to our prodemocracy commitment in Eastern Europe and Panama? Is Africa off-limits when it comes to our support for democracy?

I am not saying that Eastern Europe or Panama are undeserving of assistance. But as we in Congress begin considering the budget for fiscal year 1991, I request that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle remember Africa and its urgent needs for our support for democratic political change and economic transformation. Let us seek a balanced approach to assisting our friends and allies around the globe.

I hope you and my colleagues find the editorial informative:

BUT WHY NOT MORE HELP FOR AFRICA?

(By Leonard H. Robinson, Jr.)

It is truly amazing, even breathtaking, to comprehend the speed at which European Communist states, with the Soviet Union as fulcrum, have collapsed wholesale in the past two months. A "cold war" has been nearly dissipated overnight, thanks to the ramifications of perestroika.

The United States has rushed in to capitalize on this extraordinary turn of events. Secretary of State James Baker has visited and touched the now porous Berlin Wall. Poland and Hungary received a nearly unanimous congressional commitment of \$900 million in development aid for the next three years. Where did the \$900 million come from? Why did it take only days to secure? As an Africanist, I want to know—so do the people of Africa.

Those of us who have toiled for decades in support of Africa's continuing development have been rudely awakened to the harsh realities of how the world really operates. The fall of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the concomitant and obvious reduction in the power of communism as an ideology and way of life has riveted the attention of the West and precipitated a torrent of goodwill, resources and the promise of more to come. Indeed, I fully expect that a second Marshall Plan, aimed at Eastern Europe, is already on the drawing board. But what about Africa?

The East-West struggle has been played out in parts of Africa in cruel, painful and devastating ways, Ethiopia, Somalia, Angola and Mozambique being the most succinct examples of the chess game. The cost in human lives and property has been overwhelming. Add to this Africa's longstanding environmental calamities and chronic economic stagnation, and you have to wonder why Western nations have not rushed to Africa's aid with the same degree of alacrity

witnessed in Poland and Hungary. The recent excuse is Africa's limited value from a strategic perspective. If that is so, why then have we been engaged in "containment" there and in other aspects of the East-West stalemate?

Since 1984, African nations have embraced a number of economic and political reforms designed to diversify their economies. They have divested themselves of state-controlled and owned industries, they have provided incentives to farmers to produce more for human consumption and they have generally moved to privatization. Belt-tightening strategies have been introduced in most countries, often with the encouragement of the IMF and World Bank, but at the very real risk of social and political instability. The striking results in Ghana, Botswana, Nigeria and even Tanzania have been worthy of notice. African leaders and policy makers have publicly acknowledged their past transgressions regarding their policies, and they have courageously accepted their economic responsibility to put Africa back on a solid economic and political footing. So where is the help from the Western nations and their financial institutions, which previously were so avidly courting the continent?

On Jan. 10, the United States pledged to cancel debts of \$735 million owed by 12 African sub-Saharan countries. Although the debt of these countries is lower than that of Latin America, unlike the latter, Africa's debt is primarily "official," or owed to governments and multilateral agencies. The issue of Latin America's debt, which totals a staggering \$427 billion, is being addressed through relief for the countries of Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and others. The so-called "Brady Plan for Debt Relief" was focused almost exclusively on Latin America. No such official plan has yet been devised for Africa in spite of the fact that Africa's debt of approximately \$139 billion pales in comparison to that of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Even though the United States is home to almost 35 million Americans of African descent, its foreign assistance sadly ignores this statistic. Worse still, many African Americans fail to understand or practice the notion of "motherland politics" as their Duro-American counterparts do. Centuries of slavery blotted out almost all vestiges of identification and pride and many Americans continue to view Africa through the eyes of Tarzan and Meryl Streep. But the African continent is one of the planet's richest jewels, and we are throwing it away.

POW INFORMATION—WHAT SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED

HON. ROBERT C. SMITH

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, as many of my House colleagues are undoubtedly aware, I have spent a great deal of time during the last 6 years working to account for our missing U.S. service personnel in Southeast Asia. As a member of the House POW/MIA task force, I have met with officials at the Defense Intelligence Agency on numerous occasions to discuss specific POW cases in detail. I have also taken two separate trips

to Southeast Asia on official congressional fact-finding missions—always going with one agenda—in search of our missing military and civilian personnel. Each time I have been there, I have spent several days of negotiations with top Vietnamese officials on this issue. Additionally, I continue to work with the families of missing servicemen, helping them to get answers from the Government on their missing loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, in view of responsible legislation I have recently co-introduced to declassify information on American prisoners of war from World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, I feel it is important to point out to my House colleagues and to the American public exactly what is and what is not classified on this important matter. Only in this way will we gain a better understanding as to why H.R. 3603 is so urgently needed.

Yes, there is a large quantity of information currently in the public domain regarding POW's and MIA's. Indeed if someone were to ask a Government official for information on the whereabouts of POW's, we could not assume that he or she is requesting access to classified information. On the contrary, many Government officials, including myself, frequently provide to the public upon request declassified information on POW's. In fact, if someone were to write me requesting specific information on POW's, I could literally send them a wheelbarrow of intelligence information, including live-sighting reports, maps, layouts, and so on, and so on. Moreover, my amendment to the House Intelligence Authorization Act in 1988 now requires the Department of Defense to provide to a missing servicemember's family all live-sighting reports received which correlate to their loved one. And yes, family members are perfectly free and legal under our laws to release this information to the general public, as it is already in the public domain when it gets to the family.

Additionally, the Department of Defense also publishes for the general public a POW/MIA Fact Book which provides examples of evidence of the capture of U.S. personnel in Southeast Asia, along with specific details on the last known whereabouts of missing servicemen based on hard evidence. This hard evidence is drawn from post-capture photography, United States or indigenous eyewitnesses to capture or detention, and intelligence reports such as live-sightings by refugees in addition to maps and layouts of POW camps.

Finally, the U.S. Government continues to share classified information with Vietnamese and Laotian officials in an effort to gain the fullest possible accounting of our POW's from this war. In the words of General Vessey, the President's Special Emissary to Southeast Asia, this information involves "discrepancy cases in which Americans were known to have survived the incident in which they were involved and we believed they came into Vietnamese hands and probably were prisoners of the Vietnamese."

However, Mr. Speaker, the Defense Intelligence Agency, our chief agency responsible for gathering and analyzing information on missing servicemen, has testified before the Congress that they do not have conclusive evidence that Americans are still being held

against their will in Southeast Asia. This is despite the fact that we know many American servicemen were taken prisoners and did not return during Operation Homecoming in 1973.

At the same time, the President of the United States and representatives at the State Department and Defense Department maintain that the abundance of intelligence information received concerning POW's "precludes" ruling out the possibility that American servicemen are still alive in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of POW intelligence information legally being circulated in the public domain. H.R. 3603 will protect us from jeopardizing the safety of Americans still held against their will. It also will protect us from compromising our national security and is consistent with President Reagan's 1982 Executive order regarding what should and should not be classified by our Government. Indeed, only information that would truly damage our national security and endanger the safety of American POW's should remain classified.

Already, more than 60 of my colleagues have joined Representative DENNY SMITH and myself in supporting the public's inherent right to see all information on POW's from World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Only with the participation of the American people in this process and only once we have seen all the information on this issue will we ever achieve the fullest possible accounting of our missing men.

MEDICAID CHILD HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1990

HON. JIM SLATTERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing legislation, along with my good friend, Representative HENRY WAXMAN, which would address a very urgent and important need and provide basic health care for our Nation's poor children.

Decent health care is very expensive in this country. Total spending on health care among Americans has skyrocketed, rising from 6 percent of the gross national product [GNP] in 1965 to 11 percent of the much larger 1987 GNP—a greater share of the GNP than many other Western industrial countries spend to obtain comparable or better health care. The United States spent a record \$440 billion on health care in 1987.

But despite this massive expenditure, the health of millions of American children is eroding primarily because the uneven distribution of health care and health insurance in our Nation shortchanges low- and moderate-income children and pregnant women.

Millions of American families and children are forced to go without necessary care because they cannot afford it. Many—especially lower income working families and unemployed families—are covered by neither private or public insurance.

Buying medical care has become so expensive that access to health insurance has become a crucial determinant of access to

health care: Among low-income children, those who are uninsured receive only about one-half as much medical care as those with health insurance. Yet both our private and public health insurance systems have widening cracks. Between 1982 and 1985, the number of insured Americans grew by 15 percent, from 30.3 to 34.8 million, and the number of uninsured children grew by 16 percent, from 9.6 to 11.1 million.

Our Nation must ensure that all poor children have access to appropriate health care. The Medicaid Child Health Amendments of 1990 will help to achieve this goal. The bill provides for:

SUMMARY PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Phased-in Coverage of Children Up to 100 Percent of Poverty. Phases in mandatory coverage of all children in families with incomes below 100 percent of the Federal poverty level. Effective July 1, 1991, States would be required to cover all children below poverty born after September 30, 1983. So long as these children remained poor, they would continue to be eligible for Medicaid, up to age 18. Thus, poor children 7 and over would be "aged in," one year at a time, so that by the year 2000 all poor children under 18 would be covered.

Requires States to process applications for Medicaid benefits for pregnant women and infants and children at locations other than welfare offices, including hospitals and clinics. Effective July 1, 1991.

Optional Coverage of Children Up to Age 6 With Incomes Below 185 Percent of the Poverty Level. (Note: This provision is new and was not included in the reconciliation amendments reported by the Committee last year). Under current law, effective April 1, 1990, States are required to cover all children born after September 30, 1983, up to age 6, in families with incomes at or below 133 percent of the poverty level. This provision allows States the option of extending Medicaid to these children with family incomes at or below 185 percent of the poverty level. Effective January 1, 1991.

Optional Extension of Medicaid Transitional Coverage. Allows States, at their option, to provide an additional 12 months of Medicaid coverage to families who leave cash welfare due to earnings and who continue to work. (Under current law, effective April 1, 1990, States are required to cover these families for 12 months after leaving cash assistance).

Payment for Medically Necessary Services in Disproportionate Share Hospitals to Children under 18. Under current law, with respect to infants under age 1 receiving medically necessary inpatient hospital services from disproportionate share hospitals, States may not limit the number of medically necessary inpatient hospital days they will cover, and, if they reimburse on a prospective basis, must make outlier adjustments for exceptionally high-cost or long-stay cases. These current law provisions would be extended beyond infants to all children under 18, effective July 1, 1991.

Required Coverage of Disabled Children in "209(b)" States. Requires States that apply more restrictive eligibility standards under their Medicaid programs to low-income individuals who receive cash assistance under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program to extend Medicaid coverage to disabled children who qualify for SSI. Effective July 1, 1991.

Mandatory Continuation of Coverage for Children Otherwise Qualified for Benefits Until Redetermination. Prohibits States from terminating Medicaid coverage for a child under 18 who, due to a change in family income or resources, is determined to be ineligible, until the State has determined that the child is not eligible for Medicaid on some other basis. Effective July 1, 1991.

Optional Medicaid Coverage for Foster Children. Allows States, at their option, to offer Medicaid coverage to foster children whose incomes are above State cash assistance levels but below the Federal poverty level. Effective July 1, 1991.

Health care provided to children, especially preventive health measures taken throughout a child's life, is immensely effective, paying off in improved health as well as in financial savings for government and society. Children who receive comprehensive pediatric care, including preventative services, have been shown to have annual health care costs 10 to 25 percent less than children who do not.

The time is long overdue for the Nation that leads the world in medical technology to ensure the provision of basic health care for poor children and families. I believe this bill will help to deliver this basic care to those children most in need. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

A FEAR OF POGROMS HAUNTS SOVIET JEWS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, William Korey, director of international policy research for B'nai B'rith, has written an article in the New York Times warning of pogroms against Soviet Jews. I believe our colleagues will find his views both informative and disturbing. At this point, I wish to enter his article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A FEAR OF POGROMS HAUNTS SOVIET JEWS

(By William Korey)

At the historic Congress of Jewish Organizations held in Moscow in December, the most talked-about worry was the real possibility of pogroms in the near future. This month's slaughter of Armenians by Azerbaijanis in Baku, which has repeatedly been described as a pogrom, suggests that during the nationalist unrest across the Soviet Union Jews could again become mob victims. Thus, Jews, recalling the bad old czarist days, are particularly worried by the Kremlin's continued cold silence about their fears.

When delegates from 126 Jewish cultural organizations in 70 cities assembled, the most important speech stressed a "sharp upsurge of public anti-Semitism," which is the flip side of glasnost.

Severe economic dislocations and political instability, the analysis noted, aggravate tensions and permit the Jew to be a scapegoat for the problems of perestroika.

Documentation was not difficult to come by; more than 50 desecrations of Jewish cemeteries, some 1,000 anti-Semitic rallies, and vitriolic hate leaflets in the thousands distributed everywhere. Moreover, some 60 goons from Pamyat, a chauvinist Russian nationalist movement, greeted the delegates with cries of "Yidi!" and "Jewish prostitute!"

Beyond these hate-spewing vulgarities, and reinforcing them, is the defense and promotion of Pamyat and anti-Jewish stereotypes by prominent and conservative nationalist publications.

Then, too, there are newly formed patriotic and religious organizations that would ostracize the Jew as "alien" and "cosmopolitan" (a resurrected Stalinist era code word meaning "traitor"), and populist novelists fill their books and essays with flagrant appeals to bigotry.

Only the Young Communist League newspaper has carried as Cassandra-like warning. Written by the Lithuanian Jewish writer Grigory Kanovich, a member of the Congress of People's Deputies, the article described "clouds of pogroms . . . gathering over our heads." He expressed dismay that "as this incitement to murder takes place before the eyes of all," the authorities "ignore the thugs and inciters."

From President Mikhail Gorbachev not a single word has come—no repudiation of Pamyat or of omni-present Jew-baiting. Last year, when Mr. Kanovich, joined by two members of the Academy of Sciences, Vitaly Ginzburg and Oleg Gazenko, submitted to the presidium of the Congress of People's Deputies a petition calling for a condemnation of anti-Semitism, and for creating a special committee to follow up on the issue, the petition was buried.

Even though the petition was signed by more than 200 deputies, and Mr. Kanovich is reported to have conferred briefly with Mr. Gorbachev on three occasions, urging him to make the appeal known to the Congress, not only was it not brought before the Congress, it was stricken from the list of petitions submitted to the presidium.

It is not that Soviet prosecutors are unaware of Pamyat's provocations. In one instance, Pamyat's chief was summoned by the K.G.B. and warned against stirring up "national hatred." In another, the Leningrad city public prosecutor said he had brought an end to Pamyat's numerous rallies in one of the public parks because they violated the Soviet Constitution. Yet no arrests have been forthcoming anywhere and Pamyat's provocations remain undiminished.

The absence of any official public denunciation is especially disturbing. When anti-Jewish pogroms seemed to loom on the horizon in 1918, Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, personally drafted the language in a decree requiring that "pogromists and persons inciting to pogroms be outlawed." Later, in a historic address broadcast to the Russian people, Lenin cried: "Shame on those who foment hatred toward the Jews."

President Gorbachev, glasnost's great advocate, has repeatedly insisted that he draws his inspiration from Lenin. He could take a leaf from his mentor's book by now forcefully expressing humane concern. It could even prove helpful to his program of perestroika. Certainly, he must be aware that his enemies on the right have no hesitancy in exploiting anti-Semitism in their attempts to turn back the clock.

WISE WORDS OF ADVICE ON THE REAL MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, during a recent speech at Time Magazine's "Man of the Year" dinner, former President Richard Nixon analyzed the real Mikhail Gorbachev—his goals, his power, his weaknesses and his challenges. The historic events of the past year are incredible and Mr. Gorbachev has played a major role in their continued unfolding. Unfortunately, some in the West have become carried away with "Gorby-mania" and, to borrow President Nixon's analogy, are thinking too much with their hearts and not their heads. These are times of great hope, but they are also times with difficult challenges demanding strong, level-headed leadership and policy.

I strongly suggest that my colleagues carefully study President Nixon's very insightful analysis. After examining his comments, I believe others will agree with me that President Nixon's points are very much on the mark and worth incorporating into our thinking and policy for the new decade.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 31, 1990]

BY WHAT HONORIFIC IN THE YEAR 2000?

(By Richard Nixon)

Since this is Time's Man of the Year dinner, I would like to share with you my evaluation of Time's Man of the Decade—Mikhail Gorbachev.

Because my views differ in several respects from the conventional wisdom reflected in Time's excellent cover story, I would first like to indicate the areas where we agree.

Gorbachev is the most enlightened Russian leader of this century and possibly in Russian history. He is the best-educated Soviet leader since Lenin. He earned a bachelor's degree in law. He was born with a masters' degree in public relations.

He is by far the most popular leader in Europe, and among America's elite intellectuals, those with postgraduate training, he is even more popular than George Bush—one of America's most popular presidents.

Let me now turn to areas where I do not share the conventional Beltway wisdom. One highly respected major publication tells us that Gorbachev's goal for the Soviet Union is "an economically and politically liberal regime without any expansionist ambitions." You might reach that conclusion from some of the things he has said and done. But we should always bear in mind three hard facts in appraising his actions.

Gorbachev is a true-believing communist. His goal is not to abandon communism, but to save it.

He is a proud Russian nationalist with the same goals for his country that Russian leaders have had for centuries before Lenin.

He is a brilliant, pragmatic political leader who likes power, knows how to use it and will do what is necessary to keep it.

With these facts in mind, let us examine what he has done. His political reforms,

glasnost and democratization, have been an enormous success abroad and have produced a less repressive society for many people in the Soviet Union. While inadequate by Western standards, they are revolutionary when compared with what the Russian people had before.

Where there was no freedom to criticize the government, now there is some.

Where there was no freedom of the press, now there is some.

Where there were no free elections, now there are some. We must keep that in context, however. Two-thirds of the recent elections were rigged. While some communist officials lost their positions, Gorbachev strengthened his. He is now the most powerful Soviet leader since Stalin. He has replaced all of the Politburo members appointed by Brezhnev. He has replaced 80 percent of the members of the Central Committee. He has changed 15 of the 16 heads of the Soviet republics.

In my Kitchen Debate with [Nikita] Khrushchev in 1959, the man standing next to Khrushchev was Leonard Brezhnev. Five years later, Brezhnev led the coup which removed Khrushchev from office. That won't happen to Gorbachev. [British Prime Minister William] Gladstone once said that the first requisite of a prime minister is to be a good butcher. Gorbachev is a good butcher.

While Gorbachev's political reforms would have to be rated as a success, his economic reforms, perestroika, have been an abject failure. The rhetoric has been impressive: support for joint ventures, cooperatives, decentralized controls and even some kind words for a market economy. The results have been dismal. For example, in the 10 years of the economic reforms of Deng Xiaoping, *Time's* Man of the Year in 1978 and 1985, the per capita income of the Chinese people doubled. In the three years since Gorbachev initiated his perestroika reforms, the per capita income of the Soviet people has gone down and the prospects for the future are no better.

While his economic reforms have been a failure, Gorbachev's foreign policy has been a brilliant success. He withdrew the Red Army from Afghanistan and played a role in getting the Cubans out of Angola and the Vietnamese out of Cambodia. He has announced major cuts in his defense budget and in his Warsaw Pact forces. Most significant, he has renounced the Brezhnev Doctrine and has stood aside while his Soviet clients in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Bulgaria have been driven from office.

Rather than just applauding what he has done, let us examine why. In 1985 in Beijing, I asked General Secretary Hu Yaobang if he thought Gorbachev would follow Deng's example and reform the Soviet economy. He smiled and said, "I don't think so. But if he doesn't, the Soviet Union will disappear as a great power in the 21st century." He was right, and Gorbachev knows it.

Look at what Gorbachev confronted when he moved into the Kremlin five years ago. Everywhere he looked he saw communism in crisis. He Third World clients were all losers. Cuba, Nicaragua, Angola, Ethiopia and Vietnam cost him billions of dollars in subsidies. Afghanistan was costing lives as well as money.

All over Eastern Europe, sullen, explosive dissent was boiling beneath the surface. Communism had produced stagnation, not progress. And as a result of the communications revolution, the people in Eastern Europe knew how much better life was in Western Europe.

Most ominous, the Soviet economy was a disaster area plagued with corruption, inefficiency, shortage and alcoholism and was falling further behind the West at an alarming rate.

Abroad, Gorbachev found that all of the great industrial powers in Europe and Asia were aligned against him. Most disturbing, he saw that his major potential adversary, the United States, had recovered from the malaise of the late '70s and the recession of the early '80s, had a booming economy, a stronger military, a stronger foreign policy and a new initiative, SDI [the Strategic Defense Initiative], which would cost the Soviet Union billions of dollars it did not have just to keep up. Gorbachev is a true-believing communist, but he is no fool. His pragmatic side took over from his ideological side. He decided that he had no choice but to reform at home and retrench abroad.

We have examined what he has changed. Let us see what he has not changed.

His much-publicized cuts in defense have had a dramatic effect in reducing the Western fear of Soviet aggression. But he is still spending 20 percent of his GNP on defense, compared with 6 percent in the United States. He has modernized all three legs of his nuclear triad with new weapons on land, sea and air. His superiority, after his cuts, in conventional and chemical weapons is still overwhelming. The Soviet military is leaner but stronger today than when Gorbachev came to power five years ago.

In foreign policy, he received great credit for withdrawing the Red Army from Afghanistan. But his puppet communist government in Kabul is still in power and receives \$4 billion a year from the Soviet Union to keep it in power. His Soviet clients still rule Angola, Ethiopia and Cambodia. He provides arms to North Korea and Libya, who threaten their neighbors with aggression and who along with Iran are the major exporters of terrorism in the world.

He provides \$6 billion in arms and aid to [Cuba's Fidel] Castro, who ships Soviet arms to Nicaragua who in turn supply arms to the communist rebels fighting against an elected non-communist government in El Salvador. For Gorbachev to claim that he does not know this is happening is ludicrous. The Soviet Union has its weaknesses. But it would be stupid to assume that the KGB is as impotent as our CIA in finding out what is going on in communist countries.

The conventional wisdom is that Gorbachev deserves the primary credit for inspiring and encouraging the revolts against communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The truth is that it was Western values, contrasted with the failure of communist ideas Gorbachev still upholds, which brought millions into the streets of the great cities of Eastern Europe.

Gorbachev had a choice. He could implement the Brezhnev Doctrine and try to keep his clients in power by force, as Khrushchev did in Budapest in 1956 and Brezhnev did in Prague in 1968, or he could take credit for developments he might not have liked but could not contain.

Again, the pragmatic politician took over from the communist Party ideologue. To do what was necessary to keep unpopular puppets in power in Eastern Europe, he would have aborted his brilliant diplomatic blitzkrieg to psychologically disarm his potential adversaries in western Europe. In a nutshell, he had to choose between Eastern Europe and Western Europe, and he chose Western Europe. He decided that develop-

ing better relations with Western Europe and the United States, whose assistance and cooperation he needed to rebuild his shattered economy, to hold on to the rebellious populations of Eastern Europe.

What we are seeing under Gorbachev is a profound shift in Soviet priorities. For almost 70 years, Soviet domestic policy served Soviet foreign policy. Now Soviet foreign policy must serve Soviet domestic policy. Whether it is defense, arms control, Eastern Europe or the Third World, Gorbachev's first priority is to do what is necessary to rescue the Soviet economy from terminal illness.

By disarming the West psychologically, he removed the fear—the glue that holds the western alliance together and that provides the justification for adequate defense budgets. This enables him to safely reduce his huge defense budget and to apply the proceeds to desperate domestic needs. By projecting a benign image abroad, he increases his chance to get the credits, aid and technology he needs to revive a sick economy.

This brings us to the crucial question: Should we help him? The answer is yes, but only if it serves our interests as well as his. Gorbachev has changed since the days when he routinely supported Brezhnev's policies. But it is a change of the head, not the heart. At a time he is using his head, we should not lose ours. As long as his ultimate goal is to make life better for the Soviet people, we should help him, provided his reforms go far enough to work. But if ultimately as a result of successful reforms we will face an economically stronger Soviet Union pursuing the same traditionally aggressive Soviet foreign policy, we should not help him. We would, in effect, be subsidizing our own destruction.

Let's look at some specific examples. Gorbachev's current reforms will not work unless they are radically expanded. Trying to bail out a fatally flawed policy does Gorbachev no favor just as a banker does a borrower no favor by making him a bad loan. If you doubt that, ask Mr. Campeau. As Andrei Sakharov put it, "In the absence of radical reforms, credit and technological aid will only prop up an ailing system and delay the advent of democracy."

Even if the reforms go far enough to work, the success of perestroika is not in our interest unless Soviet foreign policy becomes less aggressive. For example, continued Soviet support for anti-American regimes in Cuba and Nicaragua and for communist rebels in El Salvador is not acceptable. Gorbachev must be made to understand that Central America, for us, is a neuralgic issue. Our policy should be absolutely uncompromising. Any sale of arms to an anti-American regime in the Western Hemisphere will not be tolerated.

Unsubsidized trade in non-military goods serves both our interest. Subsidized trade does not. Providing credits for the purchase of consumer goods would, in effect, help finance perestroika. It is in our interests and in Gorbachev's interest that he have no choice but to finance perestroika by cutting his swollen defense budget and the costs of his foreign adventures.

Arms control that contributes to stability serves both our interests. Our first priority should be the mutual reduction in conventional arms for two reasons. First, the Soviet superiority in conventional arms is the major reason we need nuclear arms. Second, reductions in conventional arms will save far more money than reduction in nuclear arms. Under no circumstances should

we make unilateral cuts in our defense forces. Gorbachev can afford to do so because he still has superiority. We should seek to negotiate mutual agreements which will eliminate that superiority.

Will Gorbachev last? In view of the failure of his economic reforms and his current problems in the Baltics and Azerbaijan, speculation is increasing that he cannot survive in power. I disagree. Gorbachev may not be an ordinary communist or an ordinary Russian nationalist, but he most certainly is an extraordinary politician. I believe that as a pragmatic politician, he will do what is necessary to survive. Ironically, this could mean that he will last not because his reforms succeed but because he will back away from them if carrying them out threatens his power.

Let us put the momentous events of 1989 in historical perspective. We are entering the most exciting decade of the 20th century—more exciting even than the two decades in which the bloodiest wars in history, World War I and World War II, were fought. We can be thankful that we will be waging peace, not war. But we must recognize that the challenge of winning the peace will be even greater than the challenge of winning a war. On all sides, we hear the Cold War is over. It would be more accurate to say that the Soviets have lost the Cold War but the West has not yet won it.

1989 was a heady year of victory without war for the forces of freedom without war. 1990 will be a much tougher year because, as history tells us, waging a successful revolution, while difficult, is not nearly as difficult as governing after winning a revolution. Revolutionary leaders are seldom good nation builders. Revolutionary leaders must destroy. Those who govern must build.

Our historic challenge is to join with our allies in the Free World in doing what is necessary to make sure that the high hopes of the millions in Eastern Europe who cast their lot with freedom in 1989 are not dashed when they encounter the hard realities of building free democratic societies in 1990.

In his book "Great Contemporaries," Winston Churchill observed that Lord Roseberry, a 19th century British prime minister, had the misfortune to live in a time of great men and small events. World leaders today have the good fortune to live in a time of great events. They have a historic opportunity to rise to the level of those events.

This brings us back to Gorbachev. He faces superhuman challenges. But if he has the courage, the wisdom and the will to lead his people away from aggression abroad and enables them to enjoy the blessings of freedom at home, Time's cover story in the year 2000 will hail him not just as the Man of the Year or the Man of the Decade. He could be the Man of the Century.

MODERNIZE TREATIES WITH NATIVE AMERICANS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago in my home district of Salt Lake County, representatives from county associations from 12 States met to discuss the possibility of lobbying Congress to modernize its

treaties with native Americans. While I was offended such an inappropriate event took place in Salt Lake City, I am pleased to report that this fledgling organization did not achieve its announced goals and that it received the disdain it deserved from both the people and Governor of the State of Utah.

I will oppose any efforts to weaken treaties with native Americans, even if they do represent an inconvenience in modern times. Modernizing these treaties is simply another way of abrogating them, once and for all. How do you modernize a promise without breaking it? How could anyone think to even broach this question without the full participation of organizations representing native Americans? Yet that is precisely what this group of county associations attempted.

By establishing Indian lands, we have willingly subjected ourselves to the jurisdictional problems inherent in native American sovereignty. But control of their own lands is the most important part of the contract we made with native Americans in what had to be, in any case, some of the most egregious examples of unfair bargaining in history. To begrudge this arrangement today is fundamentally dishonest and unfair. We can't simply keep changing the rules for our convenience. Modernizing these treaties, without the full consent and participation of the affected tribes, would be tantamount to the last land grab we will ever make from our native American citizens.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET MEANS FOR LOUISVILLE AND JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the President made a nice speech. But, his budget and plans are not so nice for Louisville and Jefferson County in two very important respects.

First, he has proposed closing Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, and with it the much needed 2,400 jobs. I intend to fight this closure.

Second, the President's budget would cut funding for mass transit by \$633 million—or 20 percent—including the elimination of funding for transit operating subsidies to cities. Without these subsidies, TARC would not be able to function.

I intend to fight for TARC and for Federal funds for mass transit assistance.

SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1990

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing comprehensive Social Security reform legislation that includes many of the reforms that I have pursued since I

came to Congress in 1981 and reforms that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have proposed.

There are two major purposes of this bill, and Congress must consider it seriously and move this year to enact these needed reforms. First the bill assures the sanctity, security, and liquidity of the Social Security System not only for today's retirees and beneficiaries, but also for all future retirees and beneficiaries of the Social Security System. Second, the bill forces Congress to deal with the real deficit this year and separate the Social Security System from the budget deficit calculations for purposes of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit targets.

In 1989, 39 million Americans received Social Security benefits. The importance of Social Security will continue to grow. By the next decade, the number of Americans 65 and over will almost double.

Today, 132 million Americans make contributions to the Social Security trust funds. We have a sacred contract with American workers to assure that their hard-earned contributions to the Social Security System will be available when they retire.

The current system must be improved so that American workers and their families can be sure that each hard-earned dollar is secure and is working to provide them with the maximum benefits when they are needed.

I have applied a three-part test to every portion of this bill, and I think Congress should apply the same test to every change it makes to the Social Security System.

First, Congress has a sacred contract with today's retirees. We shouldn't make any changes that will cut the benefits of any American that is retired today or who is receiving benefits from the Social Security System because of death or disability. In addition, we must be certain that the trust funds are adequate to cover the future increases in the cost of living.

Second, Congress has a sacred contract with today's working Americans. Congress must ensure the stability of the trust funds so funds will be available to pay benefits to every working American and their families when he or she retires, is disabled, or dies.

Third, Congress must ensure that FICA and SECA contributions are investments, not taxes. We must end the belief of many working Americans that benefits will not be there when they retire. If every American that puts money into Social Security knows that the money contributed today is a down payment for future benefits, the FICA and SECA contributions are not taxes. American workers must be confident that their contribution is a sound investment in their retirement security.

The Social Security trust funds must be taken off budget immediately.

The Federal Insurance Contribution Act [FICA] contributions are deducted from an employee's paycheck, and the employer contributes an equal amount. Self-employed individuals make contributions under the Self-Employment Contributions Act of 1954 [SECA]. These moneys go into the Social Security trust funds. These contributions are premiums paid to provide retirement benefits and the

survivor benefits of deceased workers. In addition, they can also provide disability benefits.

This money is held in trust and is not the Federal Government's money. Because Social Security is counted for Gramm-Rudman purposes, the \$56 billion positive cash-flow in the Social Security trust funds last year was included in the budget computations. The funds were used to hide the shortfall in the general revenue fund. In effect, the Federal Government is borrowing from the trust funds to cover the deficit.

By hiding the true deficit, Congress is spending the funds held in the Social Security trust funds. We are misusing the Social Security trust funds. We are betraying the sacred contract with 39 million American retirees and dependents and the 132 million American workers who have paid into the funds.

Stated in simplest terms, we are using an accounting gimmick to mask the size of the budget deficit.

When we take the Social Security trust funds off budget, it is not going to increase the real deficit one dollar. We simply need to end this scam of counting the Social Security surplus as deficit reduction.

How can Congress participate in this fraud on the American taxpayers and ask Americans not to use the same type of accounting gimmicks when they prepare their income tax returns? How can we have any credibility cleaning up the thrift crisis if we don't eliminate accounting gimmicks. How can we require people to comply with the securities laws and not cheat investors. If we continue this fraud on the budget process, we simply have no credibility with the American people. The Congress should no longer use smoke and mirrors to mask the size of the Nation's deficit.

As part of this legislation, we require the Social Security trustees to give us an accurate picture of whether the trust funds can meet their obligations. We want to know very simply if there will be enough money in the trust funds to pay the benefits.

Until we know the answer to the question, there is no reason to increase FICA and SECA taxes. This bill repeals the increase in FICA and SECA contributions that took effect this year.

In order to meet our goals, the trust funds must be managed to maximize the return on the contributions. The earnings on the trust funds assets can be increased. We have an obligation to investigate this option because maximizing the return on the assets will eliminate future increases in future contributions and maximize benefits available to beneficiaries. There are hundreds of safe investment options available that will provide a sound but better rate of return to the trust funds. I will call on the administration and experts in the investment field over the next year to help us improve the way the funds are managed.

We can have a new system in place in a very short time that will move Social Security from its present form into the 21st century. When we do that, Americans will once again know that the Social Security System will be there in time of need.

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1990

1. Takes Social Security out of Gramm-Rudman deficit calculation: Removes Social Security Trust Funds from the Gramm-Rudman consolidated budget totals immediately upon enactment of the Act.

2. Suspends payroll tax increase: Rescinds the January 1990 increase of 0.14% in the OASDI tax. The tax increase is not justified because we don't know how much is needed to keep the system actuarially sound.

3. Long-range actuarial soundness: Requires the Social Security Trustees to include in their annual report an analysis of the true actuarial soundness of the Social Security Trust Funds.

4. Study on safely increasing economic return on trust fund assets in the interest of Social Security beneficiaries: Mandates a study by the Social Security Trustees of methods of investing Trust Fund surpluses to increase the rate of economic return to the Trust Funds and to ensure their safety in the interest of Social Security beneficiaries.

5. Increases Social Security beneficiaries' outside earnings limit: Increases the amount an individual, age 65-69, can earn annually without having any Social Security benefits withheld to \$15,000 in 1991, with future adjustments to be made for inflation. (Limit for 1990 is \$9,360.)

6. Makes Social Security Administration an independent agency: The purpose of this provision is to protect the Trust Funds from diversion to other purposes and to insulate them from political interference.

Provision is similar to proposal in House-passed FY 1990 budget reconciliation bill, except that agency would be headed by an Administrator, assisted by a Social Security Advisory Board. (In the House bill, agency was headed by a Social Security Board, there was no Administrator, but rather an Executive Director of the Board.)

THE NATIONAL TRAFFIC FATALITY AND INJURY REDUCTION ACT OF 1990

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am about to introduce should not be controversial, but it probably will be. The legislation will save lives and save money: two goals that are obviously popular with voters. But the legislation asks that automobile passengers buckle up their seatbelts and that motorcycle riders wear safety helmets. Many politicians are afraid that these small precautions are unpopular with voters, even though it's the voter's own life and money we may be saving.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should be concerned about the leading cause of death among Americans between 1 and 44 years of age. Traffic accidents result in an injury every 8 seconds and claim one life every 10 minutes. They are a major cause of epilepsy and cerebral palsy. Every year, about 45,000 citizens die in vehicular accidents on our roads, an annual casualty rate almost as high as the entire Vietnam war.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] says that seatbelts could

cut this fatality rate by a third. State seatbelt laws have already saved more than 10,000 lives over a 5-year period. We must encourage States to pass laws because, before the first State law passed in 1984, nationwide seatbelt use rates were around 13 percent. With laws on the books in the majority of States, rates rose to a national average of 47 percent at the end of 1988. The laws have been effective. After Michigan passed its law, it experienced a 25-percent drop in fatal and severe injuries. Washington State projected that its law saved more than 2,500 injuries over a 2-year period. Passage of a belt law in the remaining States would almost immediately reduce fatalities another 7 percent nationwide—that's more than 3,000 people saved every year. You may be 1 of the 3,000.

Similarly, nationwide adoption of helmet laws could dramatically reduce deaths in motorcycle crashes. In States with such a requirement, over 98 percent of passengers and drivers wear helmets. The very first year after Louisiana adopted its helmet law, wearing rates for riders jumped from less than half to 95 percent, and fatalities fell by almost a third. NHTSA reports that, between 1982 and 1987, helmets saved 4,600 lives, but another 9,000 people died unnecessarily because they didn't wear helmets.

We've had strong Federal requirements before. The safety standards in the 1966 Highway Safety Act led all but three States to pass tough motorcycle helmet laws. However, when Congress prohibited the enforcement of sanctions for the helmet standards in 1976, 28 States weakened or repealed their laws. In these States, just half of drivers and a third of passengers wore helmets. This led to a 61-percent increase in motorcycle fatalities in a 4-year period.

When our constituents are needlessly injured and killed in traffic accidents, uninjured taxpayers are often forced to pay their medical bills. The State of Texas reported paying an extra \$32 million for the treatment costs of unhelmeted motorcyclists in just over a year. A startling study of a Seattle trauma center's injured riders found that tax money paid for nearly two-thirds of their medical costs. Insurance companies paid for a fifth. But victims and their families paid less than 1 percent of the medical bills. None of the victims were receiving Government assistance before the accident. Yet, for each of the most severely injured victims, the public paid an average of \$113,307 in medical costs. Studies in other parts of the country have had similar findings.

Costs for unbelted automobile riders are also substantially higher. A University of Tennessee study of its trauma center patients reported that hospital charges of unrestrained crash victims were nearly triple that of restrained victims. The study concluded that each 1-percent increase in seatbelt usage would save approximately \$5 million in hospital charges in Tennessee alone.

NHTSA says that the total costs of injuries that seatbelts and helmets could have prevented in States without seatbelt and helmet laws totaled \$675 million in 1987 alone. Why should we pay these costs when a simple precaution on the part of the injured could have saved us this money?

The legislation I am introducing provides incentives, and, as a last resort, sanctions, to encourage all States to adopt laws mandating motorcycle helmet and seatbelt use. The incentive program provides \$95 million out of the Highway Trust Fund for grants to be made available to a State only when it puts in place these laws. The grants are to be spent for safety education, monitoring, and enforcement. States may receive additional grants for up to 2 years if they meet certain standards of helmet and seatbelt use; \$5 million is also made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] to assist States in their safety device programs. Should the incentives prove insufficient to bring every State to adopt the two laws within a period of 4 years, however, a State will lose 5 percent of its highway construction fund for the first year it is not in compliance, and 10 percent thereafter. If a State under sanction passes the laws by fiscal year 1996, the withheld funds will be restored.

Mr. Speaker, many States have done the right thing to protect the lives and health and pocketbooks of their citizens. The rest of the States need strong encouragement to do the same. We should not let the few who complain that seatbelts and helmets are cumbersome force us to bury another generation of our young.

STATES WITH SAFETY BELT OR MOTORCYCLE HELMET USE LAWS

Twenty-two States and D.C. require motorcycle helmet use for all riders:

Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and District of Columbia.

Thirty-three States and D.C. require safety belt use for front seat passengers:

California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and District of Columbia.

H.R. 3935, THE MEDICAID HOSPICE AMENDMENTS OF 1990

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation to make hospice coverage a mandatory benefit under the Medicaid Program. This compassionate and cost-effective service which serves the terminally ill and their families was made an option under Medicaid in legislation passed and enacted during the 99th Congress. At the same time, the hospice Medicare benefit was made permanent. More recently, as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1989, a 20-percent increase for Medicare hospice reimbursements was enacted. I was proud to have been the sponsor of these pieces of legislation and I am

pleased to introduce this bill today to extend the Medicaid hospice benefit. This measure, which was first introduced last March, had 39 cosponsors in the last Congress. In reintroducing this measure, I am very pleased to be joined by Mr. WAXMAN, chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, as well as my other distinguished colleagues, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BATES, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DE LUOGO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. HYDE.

Hospice is the practice of caring for the terminally ill in their homes and communities, in a familiar setting among family and friends. Over the past decade, there has been enormous growth in the hospice movement, with approximately 150 new agencies created every year for the past 3 years. Today, there are over 1,700 hospice programs in operation throughout the country, of which 1,450 are full-service programs. Half are already certified by Medicare, and 200 more are in the process of becoming certified.

Through this innovative means of care and support a team of health care professionals and other specialists strives to make the remainder of a patient's life as comfortable and meaningful as possible by providing medical and therapeutic attention at home. This is enormously important, not only for the patient, but for their family, as well. In this way, hospice helps people cope with the physical, emotional, and spiritual hardships of terminal illness.

Just as important as the humanitarian contributions of hospice, however, is the fact that hospice programs save money. Hospice allows people to move out of acute care facilities, and into less expensive care arrangements. Now that the need to cut Medicare expenditures is reaching crisis proportions, it is especially important to incorporate hospice into national policies. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that hospice coverage under Medicare could save more than \$100 million over 3 years. Medicaid expenditures could be cut as well; Illinois, for example, would save at least \$1 million per year if it had such a benefit. The State of California has estimated that, once fully implemented, a Medicaid hospice benefit would save over \$2.1 million per year, including \$1 million in Federal savings. Other evidence that hospice is cost-effective includes several studies which have shown that it saves 20 to 40 percent over traditional acute care, and the fact that numerous major health insurers have included a hospice benefit without having to increase premiums. To reduce the deficit, therefore, the development and utilization of community-based forms of care is crucial.

Mr. Speaker, when the legislation making hospice an option under Medicaid was first introduced, it was with the aim of making this form of care for the terminally ill available to those with low incomes and their families.

While the Medicare benefit makes hospice available to the elderly and disabled, who represent a large proportion of those who could benefit from hospice, Medicaid beneficiaries, who are indigent, disabled, or both, still do not have need access to the same services.

Unfortunately, the group without hospice coverage includes a large number of AIDS patients, and will include many more as this tragic disease spreads. As you know, AIDS is one of the greatest epidemics to strike this country. The severity of the problem is illustrated by some grim statistics: As of February 6, 1989, there were 85,590 reported AIDS cases and 48,957 deaths as a result of the disease. Projections by the Public Health Service and the Centers for Disease Control predict the death toll will rise to 180,000, with over 50,000 deaths occurring in 1991 alone.

Clearly, there is a pressing need to care for the rapidly growing number of persons who are dying of AIDS, and this must be done in the most cost-effective and compassionate manner possible. Hospice, with its combination of in-patient and out-patient care, provides the most appropriate means of providing for this group. Last year, hospices cared for 25 percent of all those who died of AIDS. Clearly, it is a highly desirable service.

The large and rapidly growing number of intravenous drug abusers among AIDS patients is a further incentive to expand access to hospice. These individuals are often homeless or come from unstable living situations which do not allow for appropriate care at home without outside assistance. Hospice is already providing the best possible care for this group. Expanding the hospice Medicaid benefit through this legislation will enable many more AIDS patients to receive the care they need in hospice programs. Otherwise, they will be forced into expensive acute care settings or, worse, into the streets.

Because of the AIDS epidemic, the cost savings of hospice will be even more significant. Here, we may take a lesson from local efforts to cope with the disease. The average cost of caring for an AIDS patient during the last year of life is about \$66,000 in Atlanta, and \$120,000 in New York City. Neither of these cities makes extensive use of hospice programs. In San Francisco, however, care for the same patient would cost only \$25,000 because of advanced AIDS programs including an extensive network of hospice services. Hospice must be expanded to keep costs down as an increasing number of indigent patients seek treatment for the disease.

So far, 13 States, including New York, Michigan, Florida, Illinois, Texas, and North Carolina, have created a Medicaid hospice benefit since the enactment of the option. Although it is encouraging that several other States are also taking steps to create such a benefit, I believe, along with the other cosponsors of this bill, that the current need is great enough to warrant making the hospice Medicaid benefit mandatory. This makes hospice services available sooner to Medicaid beneficiaries throughout the country. The bill would become effective for calendar quarters beginning on or after July 1, 1991. If necessary, States would be allowed additional time to enact any required legislation. We urge our

colleagues to give their approval to this measure to provide access to hospice coverage for those who need it most while saving taxpayer and Government funds in the process.

For your convenience, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medicaid Hospice Amendments of 1990".

TITLE II—HOSPICE COVERAGE

SEC. 201. MANDATING HOSPICE COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a)(10) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)), as amended by section 6406(b) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(18)," after "(17)," and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(iv), in inserting "(and (18))" after "(17)".

(b) CLARIFYING EFFECT OF HOSPICE ELECTION.—Section 1905(o)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(o)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting "and for which payment may otherwise be made under title XVIII" after "described in section 1812(d)(2)(A)".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1905(o)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(o)(3)) is amended by striking "a State which elects" and all that follows through "with respect to" first place it appears.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by this section apply (except as provided under paragraph (2)) to payments under title XIX of the Social Security Act for calendar quarters beginning on or after July 1, 1991, without regard to whether or not final regulations to carry out such amendments have been promulgated by such date.

(2) In the case of a State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation authorizing or appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

DEALING INTO DEBT

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent article in the Detroit Free Press which gives an insightful picture of the economic impact of the mergers and acquisitions characteristic of

corporate America in the decade of the 1980's.

The article was written by Walter Adams and James Brock. Walter Adams is a former president of Michigan State University, where he is now distinguished professor of economics. He has served on Presidential commissions during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations, and has frequently appeared as an expert witness before congressional committees. James Brock is professor of economics at Miami University in Ohio. A popular teacher and a prolific writer, he has contributed articles to diverse professional journals. He has testified before congressional committees on both the State and Federal levels.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 29, 1990]

DEALING INTO DEBT—TAKEOVER FRENZY POSES LONG-TERM THREATS TO THE ECONOMY (By Walter Adams and James Brock)

The 1980s will go down in history as the decade of the corporate deal—a trillion-dollar takeover frenzy that produced phenomenal profits for a few but economic stagnation for the nation.

Acquisitions exploded from 1,565 corporate deals in 1980 with a value of \$33 billion to 3,487 deals valued at \$227 billion in 1988—a spectacular 580-percent jump. In all, some 26,000 corporate deals have been consummated since 1980, totaling more than \$1 trillion in value.

But this deal mania isn't creating new jobs or new plants. Rather it amounts to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic.

This is because for a nation, as for individuals, there is no such thing as a free lunch. A decade of managerial energy devoted to concocting (or fighting off) corporate deals is a decade during which energy has been diverted from the critically important task of investing in new plants, new products, new state-of-the-art manufacturing techniques and new jobs. By the same token, the hundreds of millions of dollars absorbed by legal fees and bankers' commissions have not been plowed directly into the nation's industrial base.

It is especially sobering that in 1986, corporate America spent more on mergers and acquisitions (\$204 billion) than it did on research and development (\$55 billion) and new plant investment (\$81 billion) combined. This hardly bodes well for a nation struggling to reindustrialize in the face of massive foreign trade deficits.

Statistical studies show that the average merger is followed by deteriorating profit performance, as well as losses—not gains—in operating efficiency.

The American steel industry poignantly illustrates the futility of the merger game. The industry giants are the product of some eight decades of mergers and acquisitions, beginning with the formation of U.S. Steel Corp. in 1901 as a consolidation of hundreds of formerly independent plants.

But, alas, America's steel giants are anything but models of economic efficiency. They have lost jobs and market share, not only to foreign producers abroad, but to small, super-efficient and hyper-advanced steel mini-mills at home.

In airlines, successive mega-mergers have resulted in the creation of monopolistic fortress hubs, the escalation of air fares and the deterioration of service. Shackled by their huge, merger-induced debt, the carriers will be hard put to replace their aging fleets. The prospects are hardly a traveler's Shangri-la.

Most generally, the economic infirmities of mergers, takeovers and acquisitions are graphically illustrated by their atrocious failure rate. As summarized by Business Week magazine, one-half to two-thirds of all mergers don't work, with one in three later undone. Management expert Peter Drucker puts the record in even starker terms: On average, he concludes, two mergers out of five are "outright disasters," two "neither live nor die" and one "works"—hardly a stirring testimonial on behalf of claims that merger mania benefits the nation's economy.

Nor is deal mania a boon for investors. A raft of claims shows that the stock values of acquisitive firms typically fall following takeovers—losses that cancel gains in the stock value of target firms at the time of takeover. And bondholders—who also are investors—have been slaughtered by deal mania as higher takeover premiums, high debt-equity and astronomical interest payments erode the value of bonds.

In the final analysis, a nation chooses the kind of economic game it plays. A nation chooses, either explicitly or by default, the kinds of skills it will encourage by virtue of the rewards it provides. A nation also chooses the economic consequences it will have to endure, based on the kind of economic game it choose to play.

If the objective is improved productivity, enhanced efficiency, and accelerated technological progress, then corporate deal mania is simply the wrong game to play.

The challenge is to channel business activity away from speculative capitalism and into creative capitalism. This distinction is crucial: Creative capitalism generate productive wealth; speculative capitalism merely trades ownership claims. Creative capitalism gives birth to new goods, services and production techniques; speculative capitalism merely rearranges control over the productive process. Creative capitalism contributes to economic growth; speculative capitalism is a sterile zero-sum game.

Henry Ford personifies creative capitalism at its best. He took the automobile, considered a luxury for the few, and turned it into an affordable commodity for the many. He did it by building, not by buying—by creating, not by trading what already existed.

Fortunately, Ford is not anachronism from a bygone age. America is still blessed with innovative entrepreneurs like Edwin Land, inventor of the instant camera and founder of the Polaroid Corp.; H. Ross Perot, the jug-eared, belt-and-suspenders former naval officer who left IBM in 1962 and founded Electronic Data Service with \$1,000 of savings and built it into a multibillion dollar business; and Steven Jobs, the wizard who from his family's backyard garage revolutionized the computer industry with his Apple personal computer.

As a society, we must decide which game we want the business community to play. We must decide between enterprise and speculation. We must decide between creating wealth and trading it. We must decide between investing in the future and wasting it away in an economically counterproductive game.

Given the right signals, American business can play the right game. It can rise to the challenge of world-class competitiveness.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER ROBERT STEPHANPOULOS

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1990, Father Robert Stephanopoulos celebrates his feastday, an event that in the Greek Orthodox tradition, is more important than one's birthday. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Father Stephanopoulos for his 30 years of service to the church and the communities that he has served.

Father Stephanopoulos was ordained on November 8, 1959, after completing his studies at the University of Athens School of Theology in Athens, Greece and the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Brookline, MA.

Father Stephanopoulos has long been active in interreligious outreach and dialog. In 1970, he was appointed director of interchurch relations for the archdiocese. That same year, he became the first Orthodox and youngest person elected recording secretary of the National Council of Churches. Father Stephanopoulos is author of the Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations and helped initiate the first Greek-Orthodox-Jewish dialog on theological, cultural, and historical matters. His work was recognized by the National Conference of Christians and Jews who awarded him with the National Religious Leaders Award for courageous leadership in intercreedal affairs.

Stephanopoulos came to the Greater Cleveland area in 1974, after serving at the Church of the Saviour in Rye, NY and the St. Demetrius Church in Fall River, MA. From 1974 to 1982, he was dean of the Sts. Constantine and Helen Cathedral of Cleveland. While in Cleveland, Father Stephanopoulos served as diocesan vicar from Ohio, 1978-80, as a member of the Archdiocesan Council, 1980-82 and he was president of the Greater Cleveland Council of Orthodox Clergy, 1978-80. He also served as a member of the advisory commission of the Office of School Monitoring and Community Relations 1978-82.

In September, 1982, His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos asked Father Stephanopoulos to become dean of the Archdiocesan Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in New York City. Under his direction, the cathedral has thrived and Father Stephanopoulos has developed many important outreach programs, one called Cathedral Fellowship, a program that has involved hundreds of young professionals into the church programs. Their activities include holding retreats, sponsoring lectures and participating in the cathedral's ongoing activities for the homeless. The cathedral is part of the Neighborhood Coalition for the Homeless and serves up to 75 dinners for the homeless each week.

Father Robert married the former Nikki Chafos and they recently celebrated 30 years of marriage. They have four children: Anastasia, George, Marguarite, and Andrew. Anastasia, a graduate of the University of Michigan, recently returned from Santiago, Chile, where she worked as a housemother in an orphan-

age and at a school under the aegis of an Orthodox convent. George Stephanopoulos came to work for me as a legislative assistant, and later became my administrative assistant. He now works for the distinguished majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, as his executive floor assistant. Marguarite is administrative assistant to the president of the Monarch Steel Co. in Cleveland. Andrew, a graduate of Ohio University, is a recording manager for Virgin Records in Beverly Hills, CA.

Through this career, Father Stephanopoulos has demonstrated a commitment to interreligious understanding, education and an active community role for the church. I am pleased to have known him and his family and to have worked with him on issues of concern to the Greek-American community. I take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to him on his feastday and belated congratulations on his 30th anniversary in the priesthood.

SISTRUNK HISTORICAL FESTIVAL

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the celebration of cultural diversity.

February 1 marks the beginning of the month-long Sistrunk Historical Festival, an annual event in my home district of Fort Lauderdale.

African ancestry is the basis of the festival, but I am convinced that the commonality of the human experience makes this event appealing to all. From lectures and photographic essays to the music and food of a wide variety of African-American cultures, the Sistrunk Historical Festival sets a standard for others to follow.

I had the privilege to participate in the first festival in 1980. The intervening years have seen tremendous growth as the African-American community of south Florida has matured. The 1990 Sistrunk Historical Festival reflects that maturity; the celebration is fast becoming the focus of national attention.

Congratulations to the organizers and participants of the festival. On its 10th anniversary, the Sistrunk Historical Festival celebrates the accomplishments of cultural diversity, which, after all, reflect the very spirit of our Nation.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout the month of February, our country pauses to celebrate Black History Month. Carter G. Woodson founded this week-long celebration in 1926 to enhance the awareness of the history, accomplishments, and achievements of African-Americans.

The African-American community is diverse, with a heritage fraught with struggle: For freedom, for equal opportunity, for justice, for cohesiveness. The struggle of African-Americans has often overshadowed the many success stories of black Americans who help shape our country's greatness.

The original Black History Week was envisioned as a conduit for opportunities to educate all Americans about the struggle and accomplishments of African-Americans. Unfortunately, our school systems have not yet incorporated black history studies into regular school curriculums yet.

In my congressional district, an exemplary group exists to foster an interest in and a greater understanding of African-American culture. The San Bernardino Black Culture Foundation, Inc. (formally the San Bernardino Black History Committee) is a nonprofit organization founded in 1968 by a small group of concerned citizens. The foundation seeks to heighten community awareness of the accomplishments and achievements, past and present, of black people. Annually, the foundation plans, coordinates, and directs a Black History Month parade and related cultural activities. This year's parade will be held on February 3, and is the 21st annual Black History Parade in our community. The parade is dedicated to the memory of my dear friend, Bob Parker, community leader and founder of the West Side Action Group.

A major objective of the foundation is to bridge the gaps that exist across cultural lines by bringing the local community together to celebrate Black History Month in a spirit of unity and brotherhood. Each year, the planning process begins with the selection of a theme. The theme for 1990 is "Honoring Our Roots." All ethnic cultures in the city of San Bernardino and surrounding communities have been invited to join in celebrating and learning from the African-American ethnic heritage, while expressing the unique characteristics of their own cultures. All ethnic groups will wear their own cultural attire. This visual demonstration of cultures and ethnic diversities will encourage the mutual understanding of ethnic communities. In addition to the annual parade, a Miss Black San Bernardino Pageant, the Black History Ball, and the Black History Gospel Concert will illustrate the richness of the African-American heritage and promote intercultural understanding.

The Black Culture Foundation works diligently every year to organize these events, often with very little funding. In 1990, the foundation received sponsorships from the city of San Bernardino, the California State Lottery, the Southern California Gas Co., American Airlines, the County Sheriffs' Association, Southern California Edison Co., Anheuser Busch, and General Telephone and Electric. In addition, many local organizations and community businesses have provided assistance. These groups and companies have helped to provide a valuable educational opportunity and celebration for our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the efforts of these groups, with a special expression of appreciation for the Black Culture Foundation.

CLARIFICATION OF COSPONSORSHIP RECORD

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify my record of cosponsorship. Several times last year, it came to my attention that I was listed as a cosponsor on certain commemorative resolutions. Though I support many of the sentiments reflected in these measures, I made a decision early in my congressional career not to cosponsor any commemorative. In my opinion, they are costly to the taxpayer and take up valuable staff and member time. During the 100th Congress, for example, Congress passed 258 commemoratives; merely the printing of these resolutions cost over \$50,000. If we add the expense of staff time to the cost, I believe that we probably spent over a million dollars of taxpayer funds. This cannot be justified when we are staring at an already overdrawn budget.

It is my best guess that my name has often been confused with that of my colleague and good friend from Colorado, BEN CAMPBELL. Because there are two Congressman CAMPBELLS in Congress, occasional errors in reporting do occur. Therefore, upon my request, my name has been removed as a cosponsor on five resolutions. These resolutions are: House Joint Resolution 293, House Joint Resolution 379, House Joint Resolution 106, House Concurrent Resolution 57, and House Joint Resolution 373.

In addition to these resolutions, I was also mistakenly added as a cosponsor to House Resolution 189, Take Pride in the Flag Day. This resolution passed the House before I had a chance to remove my name. I certainly agree with the importance of honoring the flag—in fact I support a constitutional amendment to protect it—but I stand by my commitment to remain opposed to all commemoratives.

Once again, let me stress that it is not the good intentions behind these commemoratives which I oppose; rather it is the time and money put into these resolutions that I feel would be better directed elsewhere.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICAID FRAIL ELDERLY COMMUNITY CARE ACT OF 1990

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today Chairman WAXMAN and I, along with over 60 of our colleagues, will reintroduce the Medicaid frail elderly community care legislation.

As you know, the frail elderly bill was adopted as part of the House fiscal year 1990 budget reconciliation bill. Unfortunately, however, it was ultimately dropped from the budget bill along with many other extraneous provisions.

Under this legislation, States would be given a new option to offer home and community-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

based services to low income, functionally disabled seniors. Tragically, the current Medicaid system only allows such services to be reimbursable under limited waiver programs, leaving these frail elderly individuals no other option than to be forced into a nursing home.

The only change in the bill from last year's version will be the adoption of a more flexible definition of eligibility—similar to that contained in Senator ROCKEFELLER's bill—which would allow persons with a combination of mental and physical impairment to qualify for services.

In the aftermath of the catastrophic repeal, passage of the frail elderly bill will take a first step toward giving our elderly constituents access to the kinds of long-term care services they want and need the most: Adult day care, adult foster care, home health aide, homemaker, and chore services.

This legislation is a modest, incremental reform of the Medicaid Program, targeted at removing an unjustifiable institutional bias. It has the strong support of the National Council of Senior Citizens, the National Council on Aging, the Older Women's League, Families USA, the Gray Panthers, and AARP.

I urge my colleagues to join me in an effort to improve the quality of life for many of our frailest elderly citizens by sponsoring this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE HADWEN FULLER

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I bring sad news today of the passing of one of our former Members, the Honorable Hadwen Fuller of Parish, NY, at the age of 94.

Mr. Fuller served in the New York State Assembly from 1942 to 1943 and was elected to the 78th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Francis D. Culkin. He was re-elected to two terms. As my colleagues who do not know Mr. Fuller hear of this unusual man's extraordinary accomplishments I hope they are as inspired and impressed as I am.

Mr. Fuller was a high school dropout who worked newspaper routes, many newspaper routes, into a part-time business that eventually gave him a virtual monopoly in his hometown. With the rest of his time he did gardening until a newspaper client offered this hard-working teenager a job at his bank.

The Horatio Alger story has nothing on Mr. Fuller. As a young bank employee, Mr. Fuller bought bank stock and was promoted, while still a teen, to assistant cashier, the bank's second most powerful position. When he returned from service in World War II, his bank job was gone, but he borrowed \$15,000 and started his own bank, the State Bank of Parish.

He later sold the bank and went into the insurance business and the fuel oil business, remaining president and chairman during 54 years of family ownership.

Mr. Fuller is remembered for his leadership in business and civic affairs. He is a true com-

February 1, 1990

munity patron whose friendship was valued over the years by many people of all walks of life.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending our respects and condolences to the family of this great American, whose passing leaves us at a loss but with encouragement by his example.

SEVENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Ukrainians and Ukrainian Americans on the anniversary of Ukraine's declaration of independence in 1918. Ukraine arose as an independent nation against the historical backdrop of World War I, the Russian revolution, and the dissolution of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires.

In the Ukrainian capital of Kiev on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Central Rada, or council, issued the Fourth Universal proclaiming the nation free and independent. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, a great Ukrainian historian, became the Republic's first President. The nascent democracy, established on a constitutional basis, guaranteed many of those same basic rights incorporated in our own Bill of Rights, including freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and the press. Capital punishment was abolished and the 8-hour workday implemented. In addition, minority rights, including those of Jews, Poles, and Russians, were protected, and more than 25 percent of the seats in the Rada were minority-held.

But these events, as I noted previously, did not take place in a vacuum. Even as the Ukrainian Republic was consolidating, more than 10,000 Russian troops, under the direction of the new Bolshevik regime in Moscow, invaded in December 1917. By 1922, the sovereign nation of Ukraine had been destroyed by the Soviets and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Gone were the basic rights and protections for which Ukrainians had struggled, replaced by a systematically repressive Soviet Government which stamped out freedom of speech and religion.

However, remaining unextinguished were the smoldering flames of Ukrainian nationalism, which today are growing stronger as they are fanned by the winds of freedom blowing across Eastern Europe. Soviet President Gorbachev has recently acceded to longstanding Ukrainian and international demands that the Ukrainian Catholic Church be allowed to conduct its affairs in a free and open environment free from Government interference or harassment. Other positive signs include recent meetings in Moscow between a delegation of Ukrainian Catholic bishops with a Vatican delegation and the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church.

We must realize, however, that, while important, these are but small steps toward achieving the autonomy and right to self-determination desired by most Ukrainians. The intensity of the desire for freedom was most recently

demonstrated on Independence Day as more than half a million Ukrainians joined hands across the Republic, from Kiev to Lvov, in a poignant and moving statement of solidarity.

While I am pleased by the positive changes taking place in the Ukraine and in the other European republics of the Soviet Union as a result of President Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika, we must remind him that Ukrainians must be accorded their paramount rights of autonomy and self-determination.

THE TRAGEDY OF KOSOVO

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the morning newspapers bring us sad news about the horrible violence and the deaths of innocent ethnic Albanians in the autonomous province of Kosovo in Yugoslavia. As the winds of change blow throughout Eastern Europe, it is time for major changes to occur in that country and, in particular, in that province. Now is the time to end martial law in Kosovo and free the many political prisoners who have been punished for speaking the truth about the problems in that region of Yugoslavia.

In recent days, over 14 ethnic Albanians have been killed as they peacefully protested in various towns in the Kosovo region. There are many good reasons why those young ethnic Albanians were letting their voices be heard. They are demanding free elections, the release of all political prisoners, the end of the state of emergency in that province and Kosovo's right to regain its autonomy from the Republic of Serbia. The basic facts about Kosovo and its problems speak for themselves.

Sixty-two percent of all political prisoners in Yugoslavia are ethnic Albanians. A few of those prisoners have been held for over 25 years with some of those years spent in solitary confinement. Many ethnic Albanians have been abused and some tortured. In the past year, over 200 ethnic Albanians have been formally sentenced as political prisoners. Many more are being detained and scheduled to be sentenced soon. The majority of those in prison did nothing more than ask for political freedom and the right of self-determination. The Albanians who are now demonstrating have other legitimate grievances.

In protests held in Kosovo during the past year, scores of ethnic Albanian demonstrators have been killed. The autonomous province of Kosovo has been under martial law for nearly a year. This is the second time that emergency measures have been imposed on that province. Much of Kosovo's autonomy was recently eroded by the efforts of a Serbian nationalist named Slobodan Milosevic who is the President of the Republic of Serbia. Since 1974, Kosovo had been autonomous. His rise to fame is due largely to his promise to fellow Serbs that he would regain control of Kosovo. In response to the demonstrations by ethnic Albanians, Mr. Milosevic reportedly ordered security forces to quell the peaceful protests

by using clubs, tear gas, bullets, and water cannons. The use of brute force to quell the peaceful protests resulted in the deaths of many innocent demonstrators. Ethnic Albanians are also incensed by the arrest of one of their senior leaders.

Azelm Vllasi, former Communist Party leader in Kosovo, is now on trial in a district court in that province. He was arrested and tried on charges of "counterrevolutionary" activity. In 1988 and 1989, he was involved in nonviolent political activity for having participated in peaceful demonstrations and strikes with other ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. If convicted, Vllasi could face a minimum sentence of 10 years in prison.

The ethnic Albanians of Kosovo are fed up with being treated as second class citizens in their own region. They want martial law to end and want self-determination. In this age of dramatic change in Eastern Europe, they want freedom and the application of justice in their lives. In a period of history when the Berlin Wall is being auctioned to the highest bidder, and Eastern European despots are being taken to court, ethnic Albanians just want to be treated like human beings.

I call upon my colleagues to work with me in Congress to ensure that justice prevails in Yugoslavia.

BICENTENNIAL ORGANIZERS GAIN RECOGNITION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the closing of a decade in which millions of people who suffered from repressive governments toppled those regimes in their quest for freedom and democracy. We must wish the people of these nations well in the difficult tasks that lie ahead. And, we must do everything we can to insure the success of their endeavors to establish governments based upon the principles of constitutional democracy.

At the same time, we must not neglect to pass on to our own youth the knowledge and understanding of the fundamental principles and values of our own democratic institutions. In this regard, I am most pleased to commend the efforts of several constituents whose dedication to the improvement of the civic education of our students is exemplary. They are Mr. Dennis Lichty, Mr. Ted Larson, Mrs. Lisa Townsley, and Mrs. Carolyn Gigstad of the First Congressional District in Nebraska.

Through their efforts, thousands of upper elementary, middle, and high school students have studied the curriculum of the National Bicentennial Competition; its noncompetitive companion program, Congress and the Constitution; and the National Historical Pictorial Map Contest in Nebraska's First Congressional District. This curriculum introduces students to the philosophical ideas of our founders, the historical background of the Philadelphia Convention, and the issues and debates that shaped the writing of our Constitution. Students learn how our Government is orga-

nized and how it protects the rights and liberties of all citizens. Finally, and most important, students learn the responsibilities which accompany the rights of citizenship in a democracy.

It is ironic that while those who have experienced repressive regimes throughout the world are clamoring for the right to vote in free elections, in the United States, only one out of five eligible voters under the age of 30 takes advantage of that very right. With so few young people understanding the purpose and importance of our Constitution, it is clear that we must do all we can to turn the tide of political apathy into a wave of active and informed participation. Again, I am pleased to recognize and express my admiration and appreciation to Dennis Lichty, Ted Larson, Lisa Townsley, and Carolyn Gigstad for their impressive contributions to the development of competent and responsible citizenship among young Nebraskans.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FREDERICK LOUIS MCCOY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1990, Maryland's First District lost a very special man. I rise today to pay tribute to Frederick Louis McCoy, an outstanding American and a prominent resident of the First District.

I wish to honor Fred for a lifetime of service to St. Mary's County and to the Nation. A graduate of Georgetown University, Fred served in the Navy in the South Pacific during World War II. In 1937, he went to work for the Farm Security Administration, a predecessor of the Agriculture Department's Farm Home Administration. He devoted 25 years to Maryland's farmers as the agency's supervisor in St. Mary's County. He also worked in the regional office before moving on to the national office, where he retired in 1972. As the proprietor of St. Gabriel's Manor, his farm at Scotland in St. Mary's County, Fred was himself a farmer.

Fred's interest in history is equally noteworthy. He was chairman of Project Chapel Field, the archeological excavation of an early church site in St. Mary's County. He was also a member of the Vinson Camalier Camp of the Sons of the Confederacy and the Society for the Preservation of St. Ignatius Church in St. Inigoes, MD.

Fred set an example as a familyman. He married Elizabeth Crowley McCoy of Scotland, MD, in 1941. They had nine sons and three daughters: Frederick, Jr., John, Mark, Joseph, Daniel, Thomas, Christopher, Nicholas, Matthew, Mary, Anne, and Margaret. Fred, who died at the age of 74, is also survived by 19 grandchildren.

As an official of the Department of Agriculture, as a three-term president of St. Mary's County Historical Society, and as a devoted husband, father, and grandfather, Frederick McCoy deserves the highest praise. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deepest sym-

thy to the family of this wonderful American and friend.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL BLACK NURSES DAY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join members of the National Black Nurses Association in celebrating the second anniversary of National Black Nurses Day. The Black Nurses Association represents the collective national voice of nearly 7,000 black nurses in the United States on issues that shape the nursing profession for blacks.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues a brief history of black nurses in our Nation. Organized nursing among blacks dates back to the early 1900's when the National Association of Colored Nursing was formed.

More accurately though, the involvement of blacks in nursing in the United States can be traced back to the 18th and 19th centuries. More often than not, during that time, when illness struck, it was a slave—most likely a house slave—who was called upon to act as nurse. While untrained in the modern sense, it is from this tradition of nursing that the commitment and dedication of service began for black nurses.

At a meeting in December 1971, in Cleveland, OH, a group of black nurses met and formed the National Association of Black Nurses. The organization, now under the leadership and direction of Alicia Georges who serves as president, is committed to meeting the health care needs of the underserved. This is exemplified in their stated goals: to advance and promote the welfare of black nurses; to develop mutual strengths; and to provide leadership for the provision of optimum health care for the black community. Many times, the Black Nurses Association has advocated and supported efforts to address the medically needy and indigent when others failed to see fit to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to salute the National Black Nurses Association on the occasion of Black Nurses Day. Their special contributions to our society and their unwavering service to all Americans is to be commended. They are a natural resource which has been a valuable asset to our Nation.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 1990 marks the 72d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence. I am proud to rise today to reassert my support for the cause of freedom and independence in the Ukraine.

This has been an especially historic year for Ukrainians fighting to regain their independence from the Soviet Union. The Catholic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church have been in the forefront of the fight for legalization and the Soviet Ukrainian authorities have stated that they would begin to permit the registration of Ukrainian Catholic churches.

The meeting late last year between President Gorbachev and His Holiness Pope John Paul II was a major step forward toward opening the doors to religious freedom in the Ukraine.

However, the strides made in the past year should not blind us to the human rights abuses which continue in the Ukraine. The struggle is the same one which these brave people have waged since 1921. While democracy has spread across Eastern Europe, it has been slow to come to fruition in the Ukraine.

We must, therefore, take this time to remember those brief years of independence in the Ukraine; to honor those who daily continue the fight for its rebirth; and to recommit ourselves to the goal of achieving that independence once again.

TRIBUTE TO THE VALLEY FORGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR PROMOTING EXCELLENCE IN SCIENCE EDUCATION

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Valley Forge Elementary School, in Wayne, PA, for promoting excellence in science education through a 6-week program "Science is All Around Us." This program is organized and run by parents of the students in cooperation with the school's faculty. The contribution and participation of these volunteer parents provides the key ingredient for success.

Beginning January 8, students have concentrated on a particular branch of science each week, participating in classroom projects and listening to expert speakers. The six areas studied are aviation/space, meteorology, chemistry, physics, biology, and ecology. On February 21, the program concludes with a school science fair exhibiting projects completed by the students and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the task Valley Forge Elementary School has undertaken. The teachers, parents, and children are making use of local community resources to spur interest and curiosity in our young. It is through this type of creative effort—returning attention to the educational basics—that American schoolchildren will fulfill their potential as world leaders in the next century with emerging scientific technology.

To Valley Forge Elementary School Principal Stoughton Watts, the teachers, the volunteers, the parents, the students, and the entire community, I salute your efforts. All of you have set a new standard for other neighborhoods throughout our Nation to judge what is left to be done to promote excellence in education.

February 1, 1990

JUST SAY YES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1990

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the November 27, 1989, inauguration address of Gerald L. Miller, the newly appointed president of Niagara County Community College. At a time when our Nation's youth are being instructed to "just say no," Mr. Miller's speech provides a refreshing and uplifting exhortation—"just say yes," yes to learning, yes to emotional and spiritual growth.

If we are to remain a strong and prosperous nation, American education must provide our young citizens with the tools and ideas to "turn retrenchment to opportunity." While Mr. Miller recognizes the need to elevate the skills of our workers—skills needed to exploit the exciting technological advances of the present and future, his speech goes beyond this. He understands the obligation to address the fundamental needs of our citizens in dealing with the consequences of our technological advancement including the intriguing ethical and moral dilemmas which are raised.

The students at NCCC, and the community which NCCC serves, will certainly benefit from the commitment and optimism of its new president, I commend Mr. Miller's speech to my colleagues so that we to may benefit from a man dedicated to an optimistic investment in our Nation's human resources and to a partnership with the community. We should all just say yes to the opportunities and challenges of the 21st century.

INAUGURATION ADDRESS—GERALD L. MILLER—
NOVEMBER 27, 1989

Chancellor Johnstone, Chairman Pawenski, Dr. Notar, honored guests, colleagues, faculty, staff, students, family and friends.

The wonderful song performed by Jennifer Neuland, Simple Gifts, has played a significant metaphorical role for me. This exquisite and meaningful Amish folk song was used in one of my children's theatre productions performed by the now theater called The Present and its very words I believe clearly express the philosophy of our theater company then, our college and community then and now, and my personal life forever.

'Tis a gift to be simple
'Tis a gift to be free
'Tis a gift to come down where we ought to be
and when we find a place that we call just right

'Twill be in the valley of love and delight
Today I am filled with feelings of love and delight so I must be in the place—this place—that is just right.

I cannot possibly thank all of the individuals who have extended to me special kindnesses, therefore, let me today first simply say thank you to all—family, colleagues, friends, actors, teachers, students past and present, neighbors, dignitaries, those within reach of my voice and those who today must communicate from afar—I love you all.

Having said this, I now feel free to single out the most significant influences on my life past and present—without fear of hurting anyone I leave out.

First I'd like you to meet some wonderful people. The first two represent the first partners I ever knew. I can only present half of the partnership in person—the other half I must present to you only through my heart for she dwells these final days in a nursing home. I am sure she can feel my love and does not need to hear my words of tribute.

This gentle lady along with a giant of a man together spent a life time raising three boys in a quiet, rural western New York village via the philosophy of just say yes. Have you ever thought of how many times today parents are confronted by, surrounded by, absolutely forced to utilize the slogan just say no? My parents were always so busy teaching me to just say yes we never had time for the no. Just say yes to God—just say yes to school and learning—just say yes to love—just say yes to the values that really matter—just say yes to family and friends. Just say yes to neighbors—just say yes to freedom—just say yes to your dreams. Just say yes to life and all of its treasury of possibilities.

This gentle, giant of a man never finished high school, but he is very learned. He never was a rich man, but his life has been filled with richness. He has received his share of hard knocks—the depression—the war years—the stroke that struck his life-time partner—but he never lost his faith in himself nor his children. It is an honor to present to you my father—Harold Miller.

Next I'd like to present to you a beautiful lady who over 30 years ago agreed to just say yes to being my life long partner—my wife—my best friend—Dorothy.

Our personal partnership produced two sons who already have proven their commitment to life and its fullest possibilities. Two young men who fill Dot's and my life with pride, love, and joy—our sons—William and Mark Miller.

Our family partnership also includes two brothers and a brother-in-law. My brother Bob is in California and unable to be here today. However, my other brother, Don, is here from Binghamton, along with his wife Carol and their daughters Tammy and Christine. Also joining us today from Vermont is my brother-in-law, Richard Noth and his wife Ina.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to personally present the Miller family partners.

Just as in a family—our community college has been and is today a series of partnerships. A network of pathways, purposes, people, a school for all seasons.

Less than 30 years ago, NCCC was nothing but a perceived opportunity—a gleam in the eyes of those inspired souls who dreamed it up and began to design the future. A partnership which included the likes of Ed Pawenski, Ernie Curto, Gene Swenson, Dr. Notar—visionaries that dared to dream of a future that was more than their past—a future that would be built on just say yes.

Through the years—perceived opportunities have become realities. Programs were developed, services offered, missions defined and redefined. Buildings were borrowed, rented, and built. A campus was born. Expansion and growth have been the reality when the doomsayers prophesized retrenchment. It has taken risk and courage, energy and wisdom, vision and intelligence, imagination and trust, inspiration, and love to get where we are today. A partnership of legislators, trustees, faculty and staff, community organizations, businesses and industry, students and concerned citizenry working together to just say yes.

To our founding president, Dr. Ernest Notar.

To our current chairman of the board, Edward Pawenski, who has been on our board from the very beginning.

To the original faculty and staff who came together with 125 students in 1963 at the shredded wheat building.

To the community of Niagara that has embraced our college whatever its size, wherever its location, and supported its growth from the original 125 students to the over 40,000 unduplicated individuals who are participating in one or more of our educational activities during 1989-90.

To our partners in the Federal, State, county and community government and to our partners in the State University of New York.

To the more than 15,000 who have already graduated from NCCC and are successfully settled in our western New York community.

Let me say thanks for your just saying yes. And let me pledge to you that I will protect the foundation you have created and nourished.

Today, we are a mature institution with an unwavering commitment in our promise to provide access and excellence to all of our students. By design we are located right in the center of our community with arms reaching out to every part of the whole. We are vital partners with businesses and industry and as such are the largest provider of corporate training in the State of New York.

We are partners with BOCES in providing access to vocational programs at the collegiate level; we are seeking out our educational partners in every town, village, and city to establish articulations which will not only guarantee access to our programs but which will assure competency levels that allow successful completion of college degree programs. At the same time we have partnered with all area colleges to guarantee transfer of our graduates with full junior status.

We have joined arms with social services to provide a 21st century solution to the devastating, debilitating 20th century horror story of the enormous human potential and resource which has been subjugated to the welfare system. Our CEOSC program of educational and occupational bridges for single parents on welfare is not only preparing successfully these mothers and fathers to leave the welfare rolls but it is also at the same time putting an end to the perpetuation of the system to their children.

As Thomas Jefferson once said, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to reform their discretion by education."

Niagara County Community College is not just planning for the 21st century. We have been and continue to be a family of futurist scholars clearly comprising a college already imbedded in the 21st century.

We are in the vanguard of Niagara's march toward resolution of our community's educational challenges. We have already seen an explosion of new classroom and office technology—so much so that we have committed ourselves to being an electronic college—television, interactive video, computers high tech communication, satellite dishes, fax machines. Our title III grant of over \$2.5 million will continue to allow us to introduce every teacher, every classroom,

every student to incredible automation in our library services and in our teaching delivery systems. Classrooms which once were created to highlight the use of chalk boards, film projectors, and large lectures will be revolutionized by satellite television transmissions, microphone/telephone communication systems that reach out to homes and otherwise inaccessible sites, and self-paced interactive video and computerized instructional tools. What a time to just say yes. However, as high tech is being incorporated into our college life, into our curriculum, into every service, we need to be absolutely certain that we allow, in fact encourage, our students to focus upon values, emotions, their spiritual side.

John Naisbitt in his book *Megatrends* indicated that with the emphasis on high technology, there is a need to learn to balance the material wonders of technology with the spiritual demands of our human nature. To illustrate his point, Naisbitt reminded us:

1. That the high technology of heart transplants and brain scans led to a new interest in the family doctor and neighborhood clinics.

2. That jet airplanes led to more meetings. Just imagine what teleconferencing will do.

3. That the introduction of technology and word processing into our offices brought about the revival of handwritten notes and letters.

4. That the more technology crept into our society the more people congregated to seek out other people. Shopping malls, are now the third most frequently used space in our lives following the home and the workplace.

5. That high technology robots and high touch quality circles have moved into our factories at the same time.

6. That accompanying the introduction of mass computers into schools is the cry for a focus on teaching values and motivation.

Obviously a balance between high technology and our physical and spiritual reality is essential. As Naisbitt called it; the high tech/high touch.

We will need to support educational efforts that encourage risktaking and testing of new behaviors; that help our students better understand themselves, learn more self-confidence—and learn more about the entire world in which they live.

There is no doubt the students with whom we will work during the last decade of the 20th century will be very different: as we attempt to project our present into the future—let me point out some of the things we can predict about our students. First, and most clearly, there are going to be fewer traditional students. The fact that the numbers of college bound, high school students will decline 18 percent over the next 8 years is well documented.

Secondly, the ages of our students will continue to become more diverse. Over 1/4 of all the students in post secondary education are no longer in the traditional 18-21 year old group.

Additionally, the number of New Yorkers 65 or older will continue to grow. Next year, 1 in 7 in the State will be over 65 and by 2000, the number will be 1 in 6.

Senior citizen activities and child care centers are now common place on community college campuses and will grow significantly during the next 10 years.

Thirdly, New York is already one of the most racially and ethnically diverse States in the Nation, with minorities currently comprising more than 1/4 of the States popu-

lation. By the year 2000, 1 in 3 New Yorkers will be non-white and 4 in 10 babies will be born into minority groups, predominately black and hispanic.

Therefore, our mix of students will be very different. Women will constitute the majority of 17-24 year olds and more than 1 out of every 5 in that same age group will represent a minority. Thirty percent of the total college going youth in the 90's will be minority members.

The education and hiring at NCCC of black-American, Hispanic-American, Asian-American, and native American residents of Niagara county is vital to the growth of this county as well as to their own well being.

Our constitution and its guarantees of individual rights and freedoms has, in good and bad times, assured the establishment of educational opportunities for all of our citizens. Yet, given such a remarkable goal, there is much unfinished business ahead of us.

Niagara County Community College must continue to expand the efforts to be the multicultural, diverse aged and gendered environment that mirrors its larger community.

Finally, value issues confronting students will be very different in the future. The manipulation of massive amounts of information about individuals made possible by the information age and the technology which makes test tube babies and a generation of artificial intelligence commonplace is going to create ethical and moral dilemmas.

Furthermore, students of the future will self destruct if we don't figure out how to curb alcohol and drug abuse and the spread of AIDS. Students must be able to gain a better understanding of how to take care of themselves.

The impacts of these trends will be dramatic and will require that we continue to adapt to meet changing needs of our citizens.

Harry Truman felt that the community college was indeed the entity of the future. He said that in 1947. It is equally true in 1989. It is true because the senior citizen population and the working mothers, the high school dropouts and the economically disadvantaged segments of the population are growing in leaps and bounds and the only education with which they truly will

identify, and in alot of cases can afford, will be the one on the bus route, the one that can hold classes when they can be there, the one that can provide child care while they're there, and the one that provides the academic, social, psychological and psychic bridges necessary for them to successfully compete.

I have great confidence that as president and in partnership with the State of New York, the State University of New York, the county of Niagara and its surrounding communities, together with our talented administration, faculty and staff, alumni, legislators, business and industry leaders we will fulfill the real object of education as defined by Ernest Boyer.

That is "to give people resources that will endure as long as life endures; habits that time will ameliorate, not destroy; occupations that will render sickness tolerable, solitude pleasant, age venerable, life more dignified and useful, and death less terrible."

I'd like to close this special ceremony of personal celebration with a poem written by another college president, R. Stephen Nicholson of Oakland Community College in Michigan.

ODE TO A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Upon the desert floor
Beneath the mountains
Listening to the echoes
From the daring Spanish Quest
here
Across the wind blown wagon tracks
of pioneers
Who loved these meadows
We build a college.
No easy task or simple plan
To form a place where mind meets mind
And time meets tomorrow.
Of all man's accomplishments
The motion of ideas from mind to mind
Is most complex
Most fragile and easily flawed
By distractions large or small
As fragile as a dew-laden spider's web
As essential as air or water
As clear as dawn on a mountain peak
As varied as the desert's early bloom
A learning place
No longer sequestered by distance or walls
This college must ride astride the

Volcanic changes of today
If we are to have a tomorrow
And so we plan and build
An expression of hope and confidence
In many yet unborn
In ideas yet unthought
In undreamed dreams
In a tomorrow which begins today.

We build not isolated expanses
Which inspire by size and grandeur
But rather form a place
Whose miniature views and quiet spaces
Create a view of the wider world.
Like spanish missions old
Whose walls turned back both heat and
wind

And sheltered all who entered
We build and plan
A place where time stands still
Where each student finds his way
To build a tomorrow which transcends
Today

To become more than he could be
Without this place
To discover
The richness of man's cumulative
Intelligence,
The excitement of
The application
Of that intelligence to life
These open doors
For all
Who seek today
Tomorrow's dream,
Who take today
That first courageous step
To meet tomorrow's challenge
Yet these doors
Close out all that
Hinders, distracts, and flaws
The infinite process of passing ideas
From man to man
From mind to mind
Doors for all
Who live today and
Dream of a tomorrow
With richer life and peace,
An open door we set
To knowledge and understanding
A place so quiet one can hear the past
So busy one can know the present
And so full no one departs less than
He entered.